1 PROCEEDINGS  UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA  ELOUISE PEPION COBELL, Civil Action 96-1285 et al. Plaintiffs Washington, D.C.  V. Washington, D.C. DIRK KEMPTHORNE, Secretary of the Interior, et al. Defendants Afternoon Session  TRANSCRIPT OF EVIDENTIARY HEARING DAY 7  BEFORE THE HONORABLE JAMES ROBERTSON UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  APPEARANCES:  11 PROCEEDINGS  THE COURT: All right, sir.  THE COURT: Good afternoon, Your Honor.  THE COURT: Good afternoon.  (The witness resumed the stand.)  DIRK KEMPTHORNE, Secretary Of the Interior, et al. One of the Interior of t	
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA  3 MR. GINGOLD: Good afternoon, Your Honor.  ELOUISE PEPION COBELL, : Civil Action 96-1285 et al. :	
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA  3 MR. GINGOLD: Good afternoon, Your Honor.  4 THE COURT: Good afternoon.  5 (The witness resumed the stand.)  6 DIRECT EXAMINATION (Continued)  7 BY MR. GINGOLD:  8 Q. Good afternoon, Your Honor.  7 BY MR. GINGOLD:  9 A. Good afternoon, Your Honor.  10:00:00:05  10 Q. Mr. Duncan, this morning you testified with respect to two UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  11 of the problems you identified at the outset of your testimony	
et al.  Plaintiffs: Washington, D.C. v. Monday, October 22, 2007  DIRK KEMPTHORNE, Secretary: of the Interior, et al.  Defendants: AFTERNOON SESSION  TRANSCRIPT OF EVIDENTIARY HEARING DAY 7  BEFORE THE HONORABLE JAMES ROBERTSON UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  APPEARANCES:  (The witness resumed the stand.)  Fig. (The witness resumed the stand.)  Fig. (The witness resumed the stand.)  O0:00:05 5  (The witness resumed the stand.)  Fig. (The witness resumed the stand.)  OR DIRECT EXAMINATION (Continued)  OF BY MR. GINGOLD:  OR Good afternoon, Mr. Duncan.  OO:00:08 10 Q. Mr. Duncan, this morning you testified with respect to two of the problems you identified at the outset of your testimony	
Plaintiffs:  Washington, D.C.  V. : Monday, October 22, 2007  DIRK KEMPTHORNE, Secretary: of the Interior, et al.  Defendants: AFTERNOON SESSION  TRANSCRIPT OF EVIDENTIARY HEARING DAY 7  BEFORE THE HONORABLE JAMES ROBERTSON UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  APPEARANCES:  (The witness resumed the stand.)  BY MR. GINGOLD:  R Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Duncan.  9 A. Good afternoon.  00:00:08 10 Q. Mr. Duncan, this morning you testified with respect to two of the problems you identified at the outset of your testimony.	
v. : Monday, October 22, 2007  DIRK KEMPTHORNE, Secretary :	
of the Interior, et al.  Defendants: AFTERNOON SESSION  TRANSCRIPT OF EVIDENTIARY HEARING DAY 7  BEFORE THE HONORABLE JAMES ROBERTSON UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  APPEARANCES:  DAY TO UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  APPEARANCES:  DAY TO UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  APPEARANCES:  DAY TO UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  11 of the problems you identified at the outset of your testimony	
Defendants: AFTERNOON SESSION  TRANSCRIPT OF EVIDENTIARY HEARING DAY 7  BEFORE THE HONORABLE JAMES ROBERTSON UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  APPEARANCES:  8 Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Duncan.  9 A. Good afternoon.  00:00:08 10 Q. Mr. Duncan, this morning you testified with respect to two of the problems you identified at the outset of your testimony.	
DAY 7  BEFORE THE HONORABLE JAMES ROBERTSON UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  APPEARANCES:  00:00:08  10  Q. Mr. Duncan, this morning you testified with respect to two of the problems you identified at the outset of your testimony	
BEFORE THE HONORABLE JAMES ROBERTSON UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  APPEARANCES:  00:00:08 10 Q. Mr. Duncan, this morning you testified with respect to two of the problems you identified at the outset of your testimony	
appearances:  11 of the problems you identified at the outset of your testimony	:
For the Plaintiffs: DENNIS GINGOLD, ESQUIRE 12 The missing data problem and the sample selection problem;	is
LAW OFFICES OF DENNIS GINGOLD 607 14th Street, NW 13 that correct?	
Ninth Floor Washington, DC 20005  14 A. Correct.	
(202) 824-1448  00:00:21 15 Q. There are three other problems which you identified whi	ch
WILLIAM E. DORRIS, ESQUIRE KILPATRICK STOCKTON, L.L.P.  16 you characterize as major. Is that a fair statement?	
1100 Peachtree Street Suite 2800  17 A. Yes.	
Atlanta, Georgia 30309-4530 (404) 815-6450 18 Q. The next one is irrelevant sample design, correct?	
KEITH HARPER, ESQUIRE 19 A. Correct.	
JUSTIN GUILDER, ESQUIRE  KILPATRICK STOCKTON, L.L.P. 607 14th Street, N.W., Suite 900  00:00:30  Q. What do you mean by an irrelevant sample design?	
Washington, D.C. 20005 (202) 585-0053  21 A. Here the notion that is captured in that concept is	what
DAVID C. SMITH, ESQUIRE 22 was the sample designed, what question was the samp	e designed
DANIEL R. TAYLOR, JR. ESQUIRE KILPATRICK STOCKTON, L.L.P.  23 to answer. And what we're able to observe from looking	g at the
1001 West Fourth Street Winston-Salem, North Carolina 27101 (336) 607-7392  24 administrative record, and specifically the NORC report	s in the
00:00:50 25 administrative record, is that the sample design was re	ally
Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR	
Official Court Reporter Official Court Reporter	
1405	1407
For the Defendants: ROBERT E. KIRSCHMAN, JR., ESQUIRE JOHN WARSHAWSKY, ESQUIRE 1 and the LSA, the sample that was drawn, was, as its na	me
MICHAEL QUINN, ESQUIRE  J. CHRISTOPHER KOHN, ESQUIRE  2 implies, really a litigation support activity or an accoun	ting,
JOHN KRESSE, ESQUIRE  U.S. Department of Justice  3 as I believe this litigation support accounting.	
1100 L Street, N.W.  Washington, D.C. 20005  4 But it was really designed to estimate the dollar expression of the control of	posure
(202) 307-0010 00:01:08 5 consistent with the kinds of things that I would do in a	
JOHN STEMPLEWICZ, ESQUIRE 6 case, in preparation for a mediation or a settlement dis Senior Trial Attorney	
U.S. Department of Justice 7 trying to estimate the overall exposure. And it wasn't Commercial Litigation Branch	
Civil Division 8 designed to answer specifically information about the a	•
P.O. Box 975 9 and completeness of the individual transaction listing a Washington, D.C. 20044	
(202) 307-1104 00:01:27 10 account balances, and the information that was provide	
Court Reporter: Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR Official Court Reporter 11 of the LSA reports really went to those gross dollar que	
U.S. Courthouse, Room 6714 333 Constitution Avenue, NW 12 not corrections that would potentially apply to individu 13 accounts.	11
Washington, D.C. 20001 (202) 354-3186  14 Q. Now, you're making this statement based on your exper	ionco
00:01:42 <b>15</b> with regard to damages issues, aren't you?	ence
16 A. Yes, that's correct.	
17 Q. And you've done that in the course of your career; you've	e
18 provided expertise in that regard, correct?	C
19 A. In hundreds and hundreds of cases.	
00:01:52 <b>20 Q.</b> So what you've seen in the NORC sample is not materia	ly
21 different from what you yourself have done in trying to estimate	
22 liability, correct?	
23 A. That's correct. When that's the question on the ta	ble,
24 this would be an appropriate activity to do.	
00:02:04 <b>25 Q.</b> And that's a sound approach if you're a defendant, isn't	
Proceedings reported by machine shorthand, transcript produced by computer-aided transcription.  Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR	
Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR Official Court Reporter Official Court Reporter	

	1408		1410
1	it, in a case, correct? If you were defending yourself?	1	identify, of the transactions that they reconciled, using the
2		2	, , , ,
3		3	different levels of reconciliation, of those that they
4	trying to negotiate your way into, is there going to be a	4	reconciled were there any differences that were observed.
	mediation, it's helpful in trying to develop your trial	_	And the other overlay here is it's not just any difference;
00:02:19 5	strategy, to have some idea of the rough magnitude.	00:05:22 5	it has to be above their de minimis criteria. So there had to
7	Q. And that is not your understanding, however, as to whether	7	be a difference in the transaction of at least a dollar. So
8	or not it is an accounting that discharges a fiduciary duty,	8	what they're saying here is actually there are no differences
9	correct?	9	observed that were below our de minimis threshold, for the ones
00:02:33 10	A. It would be inconsistent with that notion in my mind.	00:05:37	that were reconciled using the definition of reconciliation
00:02:33	Q. Now, could you give me some examples of transactions that	00:05:37	inside the ASM.
12	you're aware of where accounts are misstated? Do you have any	12	Q. And you're going to be discussing this later in your
13	idea of any, or do you have any in mind?	13	testimony, but the de minimis, a dollar, is that so
14	A. Of specific accounts that are misstated?	14	insignificant it's not worth doing any work on?
00:02:56 15	Q. Yes. With respect to overpayment or underpayment.	00:05:55 15	A. It matters for two major reasons. The first one is when
16	A. Well, the only specific information we've been provided as	16	you're doing sampling, you're going to try to extrapolate those
17	part of the administrative record was for the Eastern Region.	17	results up to a much broader population, so you may be sampling
18	Q. And the Eastern Region tells you what based on your	18	a small fraction of the transactions. So anything that you
19	recollection?	19	discover is amplified many times over when it's extrapolated to
	A. Well, there are specific instances in the Eastern Region	00:06:11 20	the population.
00:03:11 20 21	analytical work done by Deloitte & Touche that show there are	00:06:11 20	So how and remember the attribute sampling, the yes/no,
22	dollar discrepancies, there are dollar differences between the amount that is in the IRMS, in the electronic ledger era that	22	deciding what is yes and what is no, that makes a difference.  Even if it's only a dollar, it makes a difference because that
23	was sampled, and when they were reconciled back to whatever they	23	error rate, that yes/no error rate is going to be extrapolated
24	were reconciled against. There were dollar differences noted.	24	to the population, and it also affects how big a sample size you
00:03:30 25	Q. Let's talk about the historical accounting project itself.	00:06:30 <b>25</b>	pick and what assurance levels you can give. So it's important
00.00.00	Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR	00.00.00	Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
	Official Court Reporter		Official Court Reporter
	1409		1411
1	1409 I'll call up for purposes of our discussion Bates 33-3-14.	1	1411 from that standpoint.
1 2		1 2	
	I'll call up for purposes of our discussion Bates 33-3-14.		from that standpoint.
2	I'll call up for purposes of our discussion Bates 33-3-14.  MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, the historical	2	from that standpoint.  It's also important because not only is the dollar
2	I'll call up for purposes of our discussion Bates 33-3-14.  MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, the historical  THE COURT: Bates 33-3-14?	2	from that standpoint.  It's also important because not only is the dollar difference used in this notion of yes/no, which is the attribute
2 3 4	I'll call up for purposes of our discussion Bates 33-3-14.  MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, the historical  THE COURT: Bates 33-3-14?  MR. GINGOLD: That's correct.	2 3 4	from that standpoint.  It's also important because not only is the dollar difference used in this notion of yes/no, which is the attribute sampling, it also becomes a variable on the other side, which
2 3 4 00:03:50 <b>5</b>	I'll call up for purposes of our discussion Bates 33-3-14.  MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, the historical  THE COURT: Bates 33-3-14?  MR. GINGOLD: That's correct.  THE COURT: Okay.	2 3 4 00:06:47 <b>5</b>	from that standpoint.  It's also important because not only is the dollar difference used in this notion of yes/no, which is the attribute sampling, it also becomes a variable on the other side, which it's called variable sampling, where you sum up those dollar
2 3 4 00:03:50 5 6	I'll call up for purposes of our discussion Bates 33-3-14.  MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, the historical THE COURT: Bates 33-3-14?  MR. GINGOLD: That's correct.  THE COURT: Okay.  MR. GINGOLD: That's part 2 of what is the historical	2 3 4 00:06:47 5 6	from that standpoint.  It's also important because not only is the dollar difference used in this notion of yes/no, which is the attribute sampling, it also becomes a variable on the other side, which it's called variable sampling, where you sum up those dollar amounts. So there's really going all the way back to the
2 3 4 00:03:50 5 6 7	I'll call up for purposes of our discussion Bates 33-3-14.  MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, the historical  THE COURT: Bates 33-3-14?  MR. GINGOLD: That's correct.  THE COURT: Okay.  MR. GINGOLD: That's part 2 of what is the historical accounting project, and it has the historical accounting	2 3 4 00:06:47 5 6 7	from that standpoint.  It's also important because not only is the dollar difference used in this notion of yes/no, which is the attribute sampling, it also becomes a variable on the other side, which it's called variable sampling, where you sum up those dollar amounts. So there's really going all the way back to the 2003 Plan, it was always clear to me from the 2003 Plan and from
2 3 4 00:03:50 5 6 7 8	I'll call up for purposes of our discussion Bates 33-3-14.  MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, the historical  THE COURT: Bates 33-3-14?  MR. GINGOLD: That's correct.  THE COURT: Okay.  MR. GINGOLD: That's part 2 of what is the historical accounting project, and it has the historical accounting project has two basic Bates stamp numbers 33-1, 33-2, and 33-3.	2 3 4 00:06:47 5 6 7 8	from that standpoint.  It's also important because not only is the dollar difference used in this notion of yes/no, which is the attribute sampling, it also becomes a variable on the other side, which it's called variable sampling, where you sum up those dollar amounts. So there's really going all the way back to the 2003 Plan, it was always clear to me from the 2003 Plan and from the 2007 Plan that the fundamental design was based on attribute
2 3 4 00.03:50 5 6 7 8 9	I'll call up for purposes of our discussion Bates 33-3-14.  MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, the historical THE COURT: Bates 33-3-14?  MR. GINGOLD: That's correct. THE COURT: Okay. MR. GINGOLD: That's part 2 of what is the historical accounting project, and it has the historical accounting project has two basic Bates stamp numbers 33-1, 33-2, and 33-3.  Part 2 is 33-3, and the page that I'd like to discuss with	2 3 4 00:06:47 5 6 7 8 9	from that standpoint.  It's also important because not only is the dollar difference used in this notion of yes/no, which is the attribute sampling, it also becomes a variable on the other side, which it's called variable sampling, where you sum up those dollar amounts. So there's really going all the way back to the 2003 Plan, it was always clear to me from the 2003 Plan and from the 2007 Plan that the fundamental design was based on attribute sampling, it's a yes/no question.
2 3 4 00:03:50 5 6 7 8 9 00:04:13 10 11	I'll call up for purposes of our discussion Bates 33-3-14.  MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, the historical THE COURT: Bates 33-3-14?  MR. GINGOLD: That's correct. THE COURT: Okay. MR. GINGOLD: That's part 2 of what is the historical accounting project, and it has the historical accounting project has two basic Bates stamp numbers 33-1, 33-2, and 33-3.  Part 2 is 33-3, and the page that I'd like to discuss with Mr. Duncan is 33-3-14.	2 3 4 00:06:47 5 6 7 8 9 00:07:07 10 11 12	from that standpoint.  It's also important because not only is the dollar difference used in this notion of yes/no, which is the attribute sampling, it also becomes a variable on the other side, which it's called variable sampling, where you sum up those dollar amounts. So there's really going all the way back to the 2003 Plan, it was always clear to me from the 2003 Plan and from the 2007 Plan that the fundamental design was based on attribute sampling, it's a yes/no question.  And back in the 2003 trial there was some discussion that
2 3 4 00:03:50 5 6 7 8 9 00:04:13 10 11 12 13	I'll call up for purposes of our discussion Bates 33-3-14.  MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, the historical  THE COURT: Bates 33-3-14?  MR. GINGOLD: That's correct.  THE COURT: Okay.  MR. GINGOLD: That's part 2 of what is the historical accounting project, and it has the historical accounting project has two basic Bates stamp numbers 33-1, 33-2, and 33-3.  Part 2 is 33-3, and the page that I'd like to discuss with Mr. Duncan is 33-3-14.  BY MR. GINGOLD:  Q. Mr. Duncan, you've read this before, haven't you?  A. Yes, sir, I have.	2 3 4 00:06:47 5 6 7 8 9 00:07:07 10 11	from that standpoint.  It's also important because not only is the dollar difference used in this notion of yes/no, which is the attribute sampling, it also becomes a variable on the other side, which it's called variable sampling, where you sum up those dollar amounts. So there's really going all the way back to the 2003 Plan, it was always clear to me from the 2003 Plan and from the 2007 Plan that the fundamental design was based on attribute sampling, it's a yes/no question.  And back in the 2003 trial there was some discussion that they may eventually do a variable type sample. They may gather
2 3 4 00:03:50 5 6 7 8 9 00:04:13 10 11	I'll call up for purposes of our discussion Bates 33-3-14.  MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, the historical  THE COURT: Bates 33-3-14?  MR. GINGOLD: That's correct.  THE COURT: Okay.  MR. GINGOLD: That's part 2 of what is the historical accounting project, and it has the historical accounting project has two basic Bates stamp numbers 33-1, 33-2, and 33-3.  Part 2 is 33-3, and the page that I'd like to discuss with Mr. Duncan is 33-3-14.  BY MR. GINGOLD:  Q. Mr. Duncan, you've read this before, haven't you?	2 3 4 00:06:47 5 6 7 8 9 00:07:07 10 11 12	from that standpoint.  It's also important because not only is the dollar difference used in this notion of yes/no, which is the attribute sampling, it also becomes a variable on the other side, which it's called variable sampling, where you sum up those dollar amounts. So there's really going all the way back to the 2003 Plan, it was always clear to me from the 2003 Plan and from the 2007 Plan that the fundamental design was based on attribute sampling, it's a yes/no question.  And back in the 2003 trial there was some discussion that they may eventually do a variable type sample. They may gather that information. In the course of this trial it's become clear
2 3 4 00:03:50 5 6 7 8 9 00:04:13 10 11 12 13	I'll call up for purposes of our discussion Bates 33-3-14.  MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, the historical  THE COURT: Bates 33-3-14?  MR. GINGOLD: That's correct.  THE COURT: Okay.  MR. GINGOLD: That's part 2 of what is the historical accounting project, and it has the historical accounting project has two basic Bates stamp numbers 33-1, 33-2, and 33-3.  Part 2 is 33-3, and the page that I'd like to discuss with Mr. Duncan is 33-3-14.  BY MR. GINGOLD:  Q. Mr. Duncan, you've read this before, haven't you?  A. Yes, sir, I have.	2 3 4 00:06:47 5 6 7 8 9 00:07:07 10 11 12 13	from that standpoint.  It's also important because not only is the dollar difference used in this notion of yes/no, which is the attribute sampling, it also becomes a variable on the other side, which it's called variable sampling, where you sum up those dollar amounts. So there's really going all the way back to the 2003 Plan, it was always clear to me from the 2003 Plan and from the 2007 Plan that the fundamental design was based on attribute sampling, it's a yes/no question.  And back in the 2003 trial there was some discussion that they may eventually do a variable type sample. They may gather that information. In the course of this trial it's become clear that they have done that activity. In Ms. Hinkins' rebuttal
2 3 4 00:03:50 5 6 7 8 9 00:04:13 10 11 12 13 14	I'll call up for purposes of our discussion Bates 33-3-14.  MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, the historical  THE COURT: Bates 33-3-14?  MR. GINGOLD: That's correct.  THE COURT: Okay.  MR. GINGOLD: That's part 2 of what is the historical accounting project, and it has the historical accounting project has two basic Bates stamp numbers 33-1, 33-2, and 33-3.  Part 2 is 33-3, and the page that I'd like to discuss with Mr. Duncan is 33-3-14.  BY MR. GINGOLD:  Q. Mr. Duncan, you've read this before, haven't you?  A. Yes, sir, I have.  Q. That's right. And when we're dealing here we're dealing	2 3 4 00:06:47 5 6 7 8 9 00:07:07 10 11 12 13	from that standpoint.  It's also important because not only is the dollar difference used in this notion of yes/no, which is the attribute sampling, it also becomes a variable on the other side, which it's called variable sampling, where you sum up those dollar amounts. So there's really going all the way back to the 2003 Plan, it was always clear to me from the 2003 Plan and from the 2007 Plan that the fundamental design was based on attribute sampling, it's a yes/no question.  And back in the 2003 trial there was some discussion that they may eventually do a variable type sample. They may gather that information. In the course of this trial it's become clear that they have done that activity. In Ms. Hinkins' rebuttal report, she's made it very clear, and in the administrative
2 3 4 00:03:50 5 6 7 8 9 00:04:13 10 11 12 13 14 00:04:33 15 16 17	I'll call up for purposes of our discussion Bates 33-3-14.  MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, the historical  THE COURT: Bates 33-3-14?  MR. GINGOLD: That's correct.  THE COURT: Okay.  MR. GINGOLD: That's part 2 of what is the historical accounting project, and it has the historical accounting project has two basic Bates stamp numbers 33-1, 33-2, and 33-3.  Part 2 is 33-3, and the page that I'd like to discuss with Mr. Duncan is 33-3-14.  BY MR. GINGOLD:  Q. Mr. Duncan, you've read this before, haven't you?  A. Yes, sir, I have.  Q. That's right. And when we're dealing here we're dealing with sample debit transactions and sample credit transactions,	2 3 4 00:06:47 5 6 7 8 9 00:07:07 10 11 12 13 14 00:07:23 15 16 17	from that standpoint.  It's also important because not only is the dollar difference used in this notion of yes/no, which is the attribute sampling, it also becomes a variable on the other side, which it's called variable sampling, where you sum up those dollar amounts. So there's really going all the way back to the 2003 Plan, it was always clear to me from the 2003 Plan and from the 2007 Plan that the fundamental design was based on attribute sampling, it's a yes/no question.  And back in the 2003 trial there was some discussion that they may eventually do a variable type sample. They may gather that information. In the course of this trial it's become clear that they have done that activity. In Ms. Hinkins' rebuttal report, she's made it very clear, and in the administrative record you can see they have gathered that additional
2 3 4 00:03:50 5 6 7 8 9 00:04:13 10 11 12 13 14 00:04:33 15 16 17 18	I'll call up for purposes of our discussion Bates 33-3-14.  MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, the historical  THE COURT: Bates 33-3-14?  MR. GINGOLD: That's correct.  THE COURT: Okay.  MR. GINGOLD: That's part 2 of what is the historical accounting project, and it has the historical accounting project has two basic Bates stamp numbers 33-1, 33-2, and 33-3.  Part 2 is 33-3, and the page that I'd like to discuss with Mr. Duncan is 33-3-14.  BY MR. GINGOLD:  Q. Mr. Duncan, you've read this before, haven't you?  A. Yes, sir, I have.  Q. That's right. And when we're dealing here we're dealing with sample debit transactions and sample credit transactions, correct?	2 3 4 00:06:47 5 6 7 8 9 00:07:07 10 11 12 13 14 00:07:23 15 16 17 18	from that standpoint.  It's also important because not only is the dollar difference used in this notion of yes/no, which is the attribute sampling, it also becomes a variable on the other side, which it's called variable sampling, where you sum up those dollar amounts. So there's really going all the way back to the 2003 Plan, it was always clear to me from the 2003 Plan and from the 2007 Plan that the fundamental design was based on attribute sampling, it's a yes/no question.  And back in the 2003 trial there was some discussion that they may eventually do a variable type sample. They may gather that information. In the course of this trial it's become clear that they have done that activity. In Ms. Hinkins' rebuttal report, she's made it very clear, and in the administrative record you can see they have gathered that additional information on how much the dollar difference is.
2 3 4 00.03:50 5 6 7 8 9 00.04:13 10 11 12 13 14 00.04:33 15 16 17 18	I'll call up for purposes of our discussion Bates 33-3-14.  MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, the historical  THE COURT: Bates 33-3-14?  MR. GINGOLD: That's correct.  THE COURT: Okay.  MR. GINGOLD: That's part 2 of what is the historical accounting project, and it has the historical accounting project has two basic Bates stamp numbers 33-1, 33-2, and 33-3.  Part 2 is 33-3, and the page that I'd like to discuss with Mr. Duncan is 33-3-14.  BY MR. GINGOLD:  Q. Mr. Duncan, you've read this before, haven't you?  A. Yes, sir, I have.  Q. That's right. And when we're dealing here we're dealing with sample debit transactions and sample credit transactions, correct?  A. Correct.	2 3 4 00:06:47 5 6 7 8 9 00:07:07 10 11 12 13 14 00:07:23 15 16 17 18 19	from that standpoint.  It's also important because not only is the dollar difference used in this notion of yes/no, which is the attribute sampling, it also becomes a variable on the other side, which it's called variable sampling, where you sum up those dollar amounts. So there's really going all the way back to the 2003 Plan, it was always clear to me from the 2003 Plan and from the 2007 Plan that the fundamental design was based on attribute sampling, it's a yes/no question.  And back in the 2003 trial there was some discussion that they may eventually do a variable type sample. They may gather that information. In the course of this trial it's become clear that they have done that activity. In Ms. Hinkins' rebuttal report, she's made it very clear, and in the administrative record you can see they have gathered that additional information on how much the dollar difference is.  Well, really, the attribute sample piece, the yes and no,
2 3 4 00:03:50 5 6 7 8 9 00:04:13 10 11 12 13 14 00:04:33 15 16 17 18 19 00:04:44 20	I'll call up for purposes of our discussion Bates 33-3-14.  MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, the historical  THE COURT: Bates 33-3-14?  MR. GINGOLD: That's correct.  THE COURT: Okay.  MR. GINGOLD: That's part 2 of what is the historical accounting project, and it has the historical accounting project has two basic Bates stamp numbers 33-1, 33-2, and 33-3.  Part 2 is 33-3, and the page that I'd like to discuss with Mr. Duncan is 33-3-14.  BY MR. GINGOLD:  Q. Mr. Duncan, you've read this before, haven't you?  A. Yes, sir, I have.  Q. That's right. And when we're dealing here we're dealing with sample debit transactions and sample credit transactions, correct?  A. Correct.  Q. And under sample debit transactions, the statement is "There were no differences observed for debit transactions," and then it goes on, "therefore, there were no underpayments or	2 3 4 00:06:47 5 6 7 8 9 00:07:07 10 11 12 13 14 00:07:23 15 16 17 18 19 00:07:40 20	from that standpoint.  It's also important because not only is the dollar difference used in this notion of yes/no, which is the attribute sampling, it also becomes a variable on the other side, which it's called variable sampling, where you sum up those dollar amounts. So there's really going all the way back to the 2003 Plan, it was always clear to me from the 2003 Plan and from the 2007 Plan that the fundamental design was based on attribute sampling, it's a yes/no question.  And back in the 2003 trial there was some discussion that they may eventually do a variable type sample. They may gather that information. In the course of this trial it's become clear that they have done that activity. In Ms. Hinkins' rebuttal report, she's made it very clear, and in the administrative record you can see they have gathered that additional information on how much the dollar difference is.  Well, really, the attribute sample piece, the yes and no, there's no need to set some arbitrary level for yes or no when you're going to collect that information on the dollar side. So it's important here, if there is any difference, it should make
2 3 4 00:03:50 5 6 7 8 9 00:04:13 10 11 12 13 14 00:04:33 15 16 17 18 19 00:04:44 20 21	I'll call up for purposes of our discussion Bates 33-3-14.  MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, the historical  THE COURT: Bates 33-3-14?  MR. GINGOLD: That's correct.  THE COURT: Okay.  MR. GINGOLD: That's part 2 of what is the historical accounting project, and it has the historical accounting project has two basic Bates stamp numbers 33-1, 33-2, and 33-3.  Part 2 is 33-3, and the page that I'd like to discuss with Mr. Duncan is 33-3-14.  BY MR. GINGOLD:  Q. Mr. Duncan, you've read this before, haven't you?  A. Yes, sir, I have.  Q. That's right. And when we're dealing here we're dealing with sample debit transactions and sample credit transactions, correct?  A. Correct.  Q. And under sample debit transactions, the statement is "There were no differences observed for debit transactions," and then it goes on, "therefore, there were no underpayments or overpayments."	2 3 4 00:06:47 5 6 7 8 9 00:07:07 10 11 12 13 14 00:07:23 15 16 17 18 19 00:07:40 20 21	It's also important because not only is the dollar difference used in this notion of yes/no, which is the attribute sampling, it also becomes a variable on the other side, which it's called variable sampling, where you sum up those dollar amounts. So there's really going all the way back to the 2003 Plan, it was always clear to me from the 2003 Plan and from the 2007 Plan that the fundamental design was based on attribute sampling, it's a yes/no question.  And back in the 2003 trial there was some discussion that they may eventually do a variable type sample. They may gather that information. In the course of this trial it's become clear that they have done that activity. In Ms. Hinkins' rebuttal report, she's made it very clear, and in the administrative record you can see they have gathered that additional information on how much the dollar difference is.  Well, really, the attribute sample piece, the yes and no, there's no need to set some arbitrary level for yes or no when you're going to collect that information on the dollar side. So it's important here, if there is any difference, it should make a difference in the attribute side, whatever the size of that
2 3 4 00.03:50 5 6 7 8 9 00.04:13 10 11 12 13 14 00:04:33 15 16 17 18 19 00:04:44 20 21 22	I'll call up for purposes of our discussion Bates 33-3-14.  MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, the historical  THE COURT: Bates 33-3-14?  MR. GINGOLD: That's correct.  THE COURT: Okay.  MR. GINGOLD: That's part 2 of what is the historical accounting project, and it has the historical accounting project has two basic Bates stamp numbers 33-1, 33-2, and 33-3.  Part 2 is 33-3, and the page that I'd like to discuss with Mr. Duncan is 33-3-14.  BY MR. GINGOLD:  Q. Mr. Duncan, you've read this before, haven't you?  A. Yes, sir, I have.  Q. That's right. And when we're dealing here we're dealing with sample debit transactions and sample credit transactions, correct?  A. Correct.  Q. And under sample debit transactions, the statement is "There were no differences observed for debit transactions," and then it goes on, "therefore, there were no underpayments or overpayments."  What is your understanding of those two bullet points?	2 3 4 00:06:47 5 6 7 8 9 00:07:07 10 11 12 13 14 00:07:23 15 16 17 18 19 00:07:40 20 21 22	It's also important because not only is the dollar difference used in this notion of yes/no, which is the attribute sampling, it also becomes a variable on the other side, which it's called variable sampling, where you sum up those dollar amounts. So there's really going all the way back to the 2003 Plan, it was always clear to me from the 2003 Plan and from the 2007 Plan that the fundamental design was based on attribute sampling, it's a yes/no question.  And back in the 2003 trial there was some discussion that they may eventually do a variable type sample. They may gather that information. In the course of this trial it's become clear that they have done that activity. In Ms. Hinkins' rebuttal report, she's made it very clear, and in the administrative record you can see they have gathered that additional information on how much the dollar difference is.  Well, really, the attribute sample piece, the yes and no, there's no need to set some arbitrary level for yes or no when you're going to collect that information on the dollar side. So it's important here, if there is any difference, it should make a difference in the attribute side, whatever the size of that is, because that has ramifications on the rest of the sampling
2 3 4 00:03:50 5 6 7 8 9 00:04:13 10 11 12 13 14 00:04:33 15 16 17 18 19 00:04:44 20 21 22 23	I'll call up for purposes of our discussion Bates 33-3-14.  MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, the historical  THE COURT: Bates 33-3-14?  MR. GINGOLD: That's correct.  THE COURT: Okay.  MR. GINGOLD: That's part 2 of what is the historical accounting project, and it has the historical accounting project has two basic Bates stamp numbers 33-1, 33-2, and 33-3.  Part 2 is 33-3, and the page that I'd like to discuss with Mr. Duncan is 33-3-14.  BY MR. GINGOLD:  Q. Mr. Duncan, you've read this before, haven't you?  A. Yes, sir, I have.  Q. That's right. And when we're dealing here we're dealing with sample debit transactions and sample credit transactions, correct?  A. Correct.  Q. And under sample debit transactions, the statement is "There were no differences observed for debit transactions," and then it goes on, "therefore, there were no underpayments or overpayments."  What is your understanding of those two bullet points?  A. This gets interwoven with a lot of the topics we've talked	2 3 4 00:06:47 5 6 7 8 9 00:07:07 10 11 12 13 14 00:07:23 15 16 17 18 19 00:07:40 20 21 22 23	It's also important because not only is the dollar difference used in this notion of yes/no, which is the attribute sampling, it also becomes a variable on the other side, which it's called variable sampling, where you sum up those dollar amounts. So there's really going all the way back to the 2003 Plan, it was always clear to me from the 2003 Plan and from the 2007 Plan that the fundamental design was based on attribute sampling, it's a yes/no question.  And back in the 2003 trial there was some discussion that they may eventually do a variable type sample. They may gather that information. In the course of this trial it's become clear that they have done that activity. In Ms. Hinkins' rebuttal report, she's made it very clear, and in the administrative record you can see they have gathered that additional information on how much the dollar difference is.  Well, really, the attribute sample piece, the yes and no, there's no need to set some arbitrary level for yes or no when you're going to collect that information on the dollar side. So it's important here, if there is any difference, it should make a difference in the attribute side, whatever the size of that is, because that has ramifications on the rest of the sampling exercise.
2 3 4 00:03:50 5 6 7 8 9 00:04:13 10 11 12 13 14 00:04:33 15 16 17 18 19 00:04:44 20 21 22 23 24	I'll call up for purposes of our discussion Bates 33-3-14.  MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, the historical  THE COURT: Bates 33-3-14?  MR. GINGOLD: That's correct.  THE COURT: Okay.  MR. GINGOLD: That's part 2 of what is the historical accounting project, and it has the historical accounting project has two basic Bates stamp numbers 33-1, 33-2, and 33-3.  Part 2 is 33-3, and the page that I'd like to discuss with Mr. Duncan is 33-3-14.  BY MR. GINGOLD:  Q. Mr. Duncan, you've read this before, haven't you?  A. Yes, sir, I have.  Q. That's right. And when we're dealing here we're dealing with sample debit transactions and sample credit transactions, correct?  A. Correct.  Q. And under sample debit transactions, the statement is "There were no differences observed for debit transactions," and then it goes on, "therefore, there were no underpayments or overpayments."  What is your understanding of those two bullet points?  A. This gets interwoven with a lot of the topics we've talked about this morning, which is first of all what is an error. So	2 3 4 00:06:47 5 6 7 8 9 00:07:07 10 11 12 13 14 00:07:23 15 16 17 18 19 00:07:40 20 21 22 23 24	from that standpoint.  It's also important because not only is the dollar difference used in this notion of yes/no, which is the attribute sampling, it also becomes a variable on the other side, which it's called variable sampling, where you sum up those dollar amounts. So there's really going all the way back to the 2003 Plan, it was always clear to me from the 2003 Plan and from the 2007 Plan that the fundamental design was based on attribute sampling, it's a yes/no question.  And back in the 2003 trial there was some discussion that they may eventually do a variable type sample. They may gather that information. In the course of this trial it's become clear that they have done that activity. In Ms. Hinkins' rebuttal report, she's made it very clear, and in the administrative record you can see they have gathered that additional information on how much the dollar difference is.  Well, really, the attribute sample piece, the yes and no, there's no need to set some arbitrary level for yes or no when you're going to collect that information on the dollar side. So it's important here, if there is any difference, it should make a difference in the attribute side, whatever the size of that is, because that has ramifications on the rest of the sampling exercise.  Q. And does it make a particular difference, since the
2 3 4 00:03:50 5 6 7 8 9 00:04:13 10 11 12 13 14 00:04:33 15 16 17 18 19 00:04:44 20 21 22 23	I'll call up for purposes of our discussion Bates 33-3-14.  MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, the historical  THE COURT: Bates 33-3-14?  MR. GINGOLD: That's correct.  THE COURT: Okay.  MR. GINGOLD: That's part 2 of what is the historical accounting project, and it has the historical accounting project has two basic Bates stamp numbers 33-1, 33-2, and 33-3.  Part 2 is 33-3, and the page that I'd like to discuss with Mr. Duncan is 33-3-14.  BY MR. GINGOLD:  Q. Mr. Duncan, you've read this before, haven't you?  A. Yes, sir, I have.  Q. That's right. And when we're dealing here we're dealing with sample debit transactions and sample credit transactions, correct?  A. Correct.  Q. And under sample debit transactions, the statement is "There were no differences observed for debit transactions," and then it goes on, "therefore, there were no underpayments or overpayments."  What is your understanding of those two bullet points?  A. This gets interwoven with a lot of the topics we've talked about this morning, which is first of all what is an error. So what they're saying here is as defined by the ASM, they did not	2 3 4 00:06:47 5 6 7 8 9 00:07:07 10 11 12 13 14 00:07:23 15 16 17 18 19 00:07:40 20 21 22 23	from that standpoint.  It's also important because not only is the dollar difference used in this notion of yes/no, which is the attribute sampling, it also becomes a variable on the other side, which it's called variable sampling, where you sum up those dollar amounts. So there's really going all the way back to the 2003 Plan, it was always clear to me from the 2003 Plan and from the 2007 Plan that the fundamental design was based on attribute sampling, it's a yes/no question.  And back in the 2003 trial there was some discussion that they may eventually do a variable type sample. They may gather that information. In the course of this trial it's become clear that they have done that activity. In Ms. Hinkins' rebuttal report, she's made it very clear, and in the administrative record you can see they have gathered that additional information on how much the dollar difference is.  Well, really, the attribute sample piece, the yes and no, there's no need to set some arbitrary level for yes or no when you're going to collect that information on the dollar side. So it's important here, if there is any difference, it should make a difference in the attribute side, whatever the size of that is, because that has ramifications on the rest of the sampling exercise.  Q. And does it make a particular difference, since the statements that are being made are based on aggregate amounts as
2 3 4 00:03:50 5 6 7 8 9 00:04:13 10 11 12 13 14 00:04:33 15 16 17 18 19 00:04:44 20 21 22 23 24	I'll call up for purposes of our discussion Bates 33-3-14.  MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, the historical  THE COURT: Bates 33-3-14?  MR. GINGOLD: That's correct.  THE COURT: Okay.  MR. GINGOLD: That's part 2 of what is the historical accounting project, and it has the historical accounting project has two basic Bates stamp numbers 33-1, 33-2, and 33-3.  Part 2 is 33-3, and the page that I'd like to discuss with Mr. Duncan is 33-3-14.  BY MR. GINGOLD:  Q. Mr. Duncan, you've read this before, haven't you?  A. Yes, sir, I have.  Q. That's right. And when we're dealing here we're dealing with sample debit transactions and sample credit transactions, correct?  A. Correct.  Q. And under sample debit transactions, the statement is "There were no differences observed for debit transactions," and then it goes on, "therefore, there were no underpayments or overpayments."  What is your understanding of those two bullet points?  A. This gets interwoven with a lot of the topics we've talked about this morning, which is first of all what is an error. So	2 3 4 00:06:47 5 6 7 8 9 00:07:07 10 11 12 13 14 00:07:23 15 16 17 18 19 00:07:40 20 21 22 23 24	from that standpoint.  It's also important because not only is the dollar difference used in this notion of yes/no, which is the attribute sampling, it also becomes a variable on the other side, which it's called variable sampling, where you sum up those dollar amounts. So there's really going all the way back to the 2003 Plan, it was always clear to me from the 2003 Plan and from the 2007 Plan that the fundamental design was based on attribute sampling, it's a yes/no question.  And back in the 2003 trial there was some discussion that they may eventually do a variable type sample. They may gather that information. In the course of this trial it's become clear that they have done that activity. In Ms. Hinkins' rebuttal report, she's made it very clear, and in the administrative record you can see they have gathered that additional information on how much the dollar difference is.  Well, really, the attribute sample piece, the yes and no, there's no need to set some arbitrary level for yes or no when you're going to collect that information on the dollar side. So it's important here, if there is any difference, it should make a difference in the attribute side, whatever the size of that is, because that has ramifications on the rest of the sampling exercise.  Q. And does it make a particular difference, since the

		1	
	1412		1414
1	opposed to statements particularly to an individual Indian trust	1	larger sample size?
2	beneficiary's account?	2	A. No. All it would do is it would make the estimate of the
3	A. Well, here the statements that are made in the aggregate	3	underpayment or the overpayment, and if they go the next step of
4	are really driven off of both the yes/no question and off of the	4	netting it, it would make each one of those a little more
00:08:12 <b>5</b>	dollar size question, so it makes a difference in both	00:11:07 <b>5</b>	precise, but it's not going to solve the underlying problem of
6	instances.	6	the inability to say something about the individual account
7	<b>Q.</b> And therefore whether it's a dollar or 58 cents, it may be	7	balance.
8	significant when you're extrapolating to the entire population,	8	<b>Q.</b> And would that information enable the defendants to confirm
9	correct?	9	that individual transactions were accurate?
00:08:23 10	A. They need to be tracked down. As Dr. Scheuren correctly	00:11:21 10	A. I'm not sure I follow that question.
11	pointed out, a mistake of 58 cents, you need if it's not	11	<b>Q.</b> Okay. If you have a mean overpayment and mean underpayment
12	reconciled, you need to spend time tracking it down,	12	associated with a posted transaction on two electronic systems
13	particularly when you're sampling, because if that transaction	13	and you expanded the sample size, you could not confirm based on
14	should have been \$58 or \$58,000, that's going to make a big	14	that information that the individual transaction was accurate,
00:08:43 15	difference as to how you extrapolate the implications up to the	00:11:43 15	could you?
16	population that you're able to extrapolate to.	16	A. You wouldn't have any basis.
17	<b>Q.</b> We've been discussing on this page the sample debit	17	Q. It provides nothing for you, does it?
18	transactions. Does the same concern exist with regard to	18	A. Correct.
19	sampled credit transactions?	19	Q. I'd like to move on to problem No. 4, which you've
00:08:57 <b>20</b>	A. It does, but there's an additional layer to the flaw here	00:11:53 <b>20</b>	described as inappropriate sampling unit. Can you please
21	in thinking. And that is, we read here there are 11	21	explain what you mean by an inappropriate sampling unit?
22	underpayment differences totaling 341, and 25 overpayment	22	A. The issue that comes to bear here is we're trying to
23	differences totaling 853. And then the conclusion is the net	23	understand what happened in accounts. Inside of the accounts
24	overpayment was 512.	24	there are transactions.
00:09:15 <b>25</b>	And this is another difference that Dr. Hinkins and I have.	00:12:14 <b>25</b>	I think that DOI and certainly NORC recognized early on
	Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR		Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
	Official Court Reporter		Official Court Reporter
	Official Court Reporter		Official Court Reporter
1	<u>'</u>	1	'
2	1413	1 2	1415
	1413 And this goes directly to my notion of sample design. It's	_	1415 that sampling accounts would be problematic, because there's a
2	And this goes directly to my notion of sample design. It's irrelevant, the last part of that sentence is irrelevant to an	2	that sampling accounts would be problematic, because there's a likelihood, a reasonable likelihood that there would be an error
2 3 4 00:09:33 5	And this goes directly to my notion of sample design. It's irrelevant, the last part of that sentence is irrelevant to an individual account holder. It makes perfect sense in estimating	2 3 4 00:12:37 <b>5</b>	that sampling accounts would be problematic, because there's a likelihood, a reasonable likelihood that there would be an error in one of the transactions in the account. So as a matter of
2 3 4 00:09:33 5 6	And this goes directly to my notion of sample design. It's irrelevant, the last part of that sentence is irrelevant to an individual account holder. It makes perfect sense in estimating exposure from liability in a litigation setting, but if I'm	2 3 4 00:12:37 5 6	that sampling accounts would be problematic, because there's a likelihood, a reasonable likelihood that there would be an error in one of the transactions in the account. So as a matter of fact, early on in this process, when there were discussions
2 3 4 00:09:33 5 6 7	And this goes directly to my notion of sample design. It's irrelevant, the last part of that sentence is irrelevant to an individual account holder. It makes perfect sense in estimating exposure from liability in a litigation setting, but if I'm the individual that was underpaid \$341, just take this example,	2 3 4 00:12:37 5 6 7	that sampling accounts would be problematic, because there's a likelihood, a reasonable likelihood that there would be an error in one of the transactions in the account. So as a matter of fact, early on in this process, when there were discussions about sampling accounts, sampling transactions, and they were
2 3 4 00:09:33 5 6 7 8	And this goes directly to my notion of sample design. It's irrelevant, the last part of that sentence is irrelevant to an individual account holder. It makes perfect sense in estimating exposure from liability in a litigation setting, but if I'm the individual that was underpaid \$341, just take this example, if someone else was overpaid \$853, that's irrelevant to me. You	2 3 4 00:12:37 5 6 7 8	that sampling accounts would be problematic, because there's a likelihood, a reasonable likelihood that there would be an error in one of the transactions in the account. So as a matter of fact, early on in this process, when there were discussions about sampling accounts, sampling transactions, and they were weighing out the strengths and weaknesses, it was specifically
2 3 4 00:09:33 5 6 7 8 9	And this goes directly to my notion of sample design. It's irrelevant, the last part of that sentence is irrelevant to an individual account holder. It makes perfect sense in estimating exposure from liability in a litigation setting, but if I'm the individual that was underpaid \$341, just take this example, if someone else was overpaid \$853, that's irrelevant to me. You can't offset those transactions.	2 3 4 00:12:37 5 6 7 8 9	that sampling accounts would be problematic, because there's a likelihood, a reasonable likelihood that there would be an error in one of the transactions in the account. So as a matter of fact, early on in this process, when there were discussions about sampling accounts, sampling transactions, and they were weighing out the strengths and weaknesses, it was specifically articulated that even if you have very, very low error rates in
2 3 4 00:09:33 5 6 7 8 9 00:09:52 10	And this goes directly to my notion of sample design. It's irrelevant, the last part of that sentence is irrelevant to an individual account holder. It makes perfect sense in estimating exposure from liability in a litigation setting, but if I'm the individual that was underpaid \$341, just take this example, if someone else was overpaid \$853, that's irrelevant to me. You can't offset those transactions.  And the sample design and what was reported in the sampling really gets this notion of the net. That's the way it's reported by the accountants, that's the way it's reported in the	2 3 4 00:12:37 5 6 7 8 9 00:12:56 10	that sampling accounts would be problematic, because there's a likelihood, a reasonable likelihood that there would be an error in one of the transactions in the account. So as a matter of fact, early on in this process, when there were discussions about sampling accounts, sampling transactions, and they were weighing out the strengths and weaknesses, it was specifically articulated that even if you have very, very low error rates in the transactions, which is really contrary to what you would assume given all of the other reports from accountants and GAO, but if you assume it was going to be a very low transaction
2 3 4 00:09:33 5 6 7 8 9 00:09:52 10 11	And this goes directly to my notion of sample design. It's irrelevant, the last part of that sentence is irrelevant to an individual account holder. It makes perfect sense in estimating exposure from liability in a litigation setting, but if I'm the individual that was underpaid \$341, just take this example, if someone else was overpaid \$853, that's irrelevant to me. You can't offset those transactions.  And the sample design and what was reported in the sampling really gets this notion of the net. That's the way it's	2 3 4 00:12:37 5 6 7 8 9 00:12:56 10	that sampling accounts would be problematic, because there's a likelihood, a reasonable likelihood that there would be an error in one of the transactions in the account. So as a matter of fact, early on in this process, when there were discussions about sampling accounts, sampling transactions, and they were weighing out the strengths and weaknesses, it was specifically articulated that even if you have very, very low error rates in the transactions, which is really contrary to what you would assume given all of the other reports from accountants and GAO,
2 3 4 00:09:33 5 6 7 8 9 00:09:52 10 11	And this goes directly to my notion of sample design. It's irrelevant, the last part of that sentence is irrelevant to an individual account holder. It makes perfect sense in estimating exposure from liability in a litigation setting, but if I'm the individual that was underpaid \$341, just take this example, if someone else was overpaid \$853, that's irrelevant to me. You can't offset those transactions.  And the sample design and what was reported in the sampling really gets this notion of the net. That's the way it's reported by the accountants, that's the way it's reported in the 2007 Plan, and that netting is inappropriate in the context of trying to answer the question for individual account holders.	2 3 4 00:12:37 5 6 7 8 9 00:12:56 10 11	that sampling accounts would be problematic, because there's a likelihood, a reasonable likelihood that there would be an error in one of the transactions in the account. So as a matter of fact, early on in this process, when there were discussions about sampling accounts, sampling transactions, and they were weighing out the strengths and weaknesses, it was specifically articulated that even if you have very, very low error rates in the transactions, which is really contrary to what you would assume given all of the other reports from accountants and GAO, but if you assume it was going to be a very low transaction
2 3 4 00:09:33 5 6 7 8 9 00:09:52 10 11 12 13	And this goes directly to my notion of sample design. It's irrelevant, the last part of that sentence is irrelevant to an individual account holder. It makes perfect sense in estimating exposure from liability in a litigation setting, but if I'm the individual that was underpaid \$341, just take this example, if someone else was overpaid \$853, that's irrelevant to me. You can't offset those transactions.  And the sample design and what was reported in the sampling really gets this notion of the net. That's the way it's reported by the accountants, that's the way it's reported in the 2007 Plan, and that netting is inappropriate in the context of	2 3 4 00:12:37 5 6 7 8 9 00:12:56 10 11 12 13	that sampling accounts would be problematic, because there's a likelihood, a reasonable likelihood that there would be an error in one of the transactions in the account. So as a matter of fact, early on in this process, when there were discussions about sampling accounts, sampling transactions, and they were weighing out the strengths and weaknesses, it was specifically articulated that even if you have very, very low error rates in the transactions, which is really contrary to what you would assume given all of the other reports from accountants and GAO, but if you assume it was going to be a very low transaction error rate, by the time you lumped all of those transactions into an account, what you're going to end up with was a high likelihood that you're going on have the account balance
2 3 4 00:09:33 5 6 7 8 9 00:09:52 10 11 12 13 14	And this goes directly to my notion of sample design. It's irrelevant, the last part of that sentence is irrelevant to an individual account holder. It makes perfect sense in estimating exposure from liability in a litigation setting, but if I'm the individual that was underpaid \$341, just take this example, if someone else was overpaid \$853, that's irrelevant to me. You can't offset those transactions.  And the sample design and what was reported in the sampling really gets this notion of the net. That's the way it's reported by the accountants, that's the way it's reported in the 2007 Plan, and that netting is inappropriate in the context of trying to answer the question for individual account holders.  Q. Is it your understanding, then, that at the completion of the statistical sampling exercise, that the statement that would	2 3 4 00:12:37 5 6 7 8 9 00:12:56 10 11 12 13 14	that sampling accounts would be problematic, because there's a likelihood, a reasonable likelihood that there would be an error in one of the transactions in the account. So as a matter of fact, early on in this process, when there were discussions about sampling accounts, sampling transactions, and they were weighing out the strengths and weaknesses, it was specifically articulated that even if you have very, very low error rates in the transactions, which is really contrary to what you would assume given all of the other reports from accountants and GAO, but if you assume it was going to be a very low transaction error rate, by the time you lumped all of those transactions into an account, what you're going to end up with was a high
2 3 4 00:09:33 5 6 7 8 9 00:09:52 10 11 12 13 14 00:10:12 15	And this goes directly to my notion of sample design. It's irrelevant, the last part of that sentence is irrelevant to an individual account holder. It makes perfect sense in estimating exposure from liability in a litigation setting, but if I'm the individual that was underpaid \$341, just take this example, if someone else was overpaid \$853, that's irrelevant to me. You can't offset those transactions.  And the sample design and what was reported in the sampling really gets this notion of the net. That's the way it's reported by the accountants, that's the way it's reported in the 2007 Plan, and that netting is inappropriate in the context of trying to answer the question for individual account holders.  Q. Is it your understanding, then, that at the completion of the statistical sampling exercise, that the statement that would be made to the account holder who is underpaid \$341 is that his	2 3 4 00:12:37 5 6 7 8 9 00:12:56 10 11 12 13 14 00:13:09 15	that sampling accounts would be problematic, because there's a likelihood, a reasonable likelihood that there would be an error in one of the transactions in the account. So as a matter of fact, early on in this process, when there were discussions about sampling accounts, sampling transactions, and they were weighing out the strengths and weaknesses, it was specifically articulated that even if you have very, very low error rates in the transactions, which is really contrary to what you would assume given all of the other reports from accountants and GAO, but if you assume it was going to be a very low transaction error rate, by the time you lumped all of those transactions into an account, what you're going to end up with was a high likelihood that you're going on have the account balance
2 3 4 00:09:33 5 6 7 8 9 00:09:52 10 11 12 13 14 00:10:12 15 16	And this goes directly to my notion of sample design. It's irrelevant, the last part of that sentence is irrelevant to an individual account holder. It makes perfect sense in estimating exposure from liability in a litigation setting, but if I'm the individual that was underpaid \$341, just take this example, if someone else was overpaid \$853, that's irrelevant to me. You can't offset those transactions.  And the sample design and what was reported in the sampling really gets this notion of the net. That's the way it's reported by the accountants, that's the way it's reported in the 2007 Plan, and that netting is inappropriate in the context of trying to answer the question for individual account holders.  Q. Is it your understanding, then, that at the completion of the statistical sampling exercise, that the statement that would be made to the account holder who is underpaid \$341 is that his stated balance is more likely than not accurate, and he would	2 3 4 00:12:37 5 6 7 8 9 00:12:56 10 11 12 13 14 00:13:09 15 16	that sampling accounts would be problematic, because there's a likelihood, a reasonable likelihood that there would be an error in one of the transactions in the account. So as a matter of fact, early on in this process, when there were discussions about sampling accounts, sampling transactions, and they were weighing out the strengths and weaknesses, it was specifically articulated that even if you have very, very low error rates in the transactions, which is really contrary to what you would assume given all of the other reports from accountants and GAO, but if you assume it was going to be a very low transaction error rate, by the time you lumped all of those transactions into an account, what you're going to end up with was a high likelihood that you're going on have the account balance misstated.  So looking at the transactions, let's say you assume there's only 1 percent error rate. Given the average size of
2 3 4 00:09:33 5 6 7 8 9 00:09:52 10 11 12 13 14 00:10:12 15 16 17	And this goes directly to my notion of sample design. It's irrelevant, the last part of that sentence is irrelevant to an individual account holder. It makes perfect sense in estimating exposure from liability in a litigation setting, but if I'm the individual that was underpaid \$341, just take this example, if someone else was overpaid \$853, that's irrelevant to me. You can't offset those transactions.  And the sample design and what was reported in the sampling really gets this notion of the net. That's the way it's reported by the accountants, that's the way it's reported in the 2007 Plan, and that netting is inappropriate in the context of trying to answer the question for individual account holders.  Q. Is it your understanding, then, that at the completion of the statistical sampling exercise, that the statement that would be made to the account holder who is underpaid \$341 is that his stated balance is more likely than not accurate, and he would not be told he was underpaid \$341?	2 3 4 00:12:37 5 6 7 8 9 00:12:56 10 11 12 13 14 00:13:09 15 16 17	that sampling accounts would be problematic, because there's a likelihood, a reasonable likelihood that there would be an error in one of the transactions in the account. So as a matter of fact, early on in this process, when there were discussions about sampling accounts, sampling transactions, and they were weighing out the strengths and weaknesses, it was specifically articulated that even if you have very, very low error rates in the transactions, which is really contrary to what you would assume given all of the other reports from accountants and GAO, but if you assume it was going to be a very low transaction error rate, by the time you lumped all of those transactions into an account, what you're going to end up with was a high likelihood that you're going on have the account balance misstated.  So looking at the transactions, let's say you assume there's only 1 percent error rate. Given the average size of these accounts, by the time you look at each account and say
2 3 4 00:09:33 5 6 7 8 9 00:09:52 10 11 12 13 14 00:10:12 15 16 17 18	And this goes directly to my notion of sample design. It's irrelevant, the last part of that sentence is irrelevant to an individual account holder. It makes perfect sense in estimating exposure from liability in a litigation setting, but if I'm the individual that was underpaid \$341, just take this example, if someone else was overpaid \$853, that's irrelevant to me. You can't offset those transactions.  And the sample design and what was reported in the sampling really gets this notion of the net. That's the way it's reported by the accountants, that's the way it's reported in the 2007 Plan, and that netting is inappropriate in the context of trying to answer the question for individual account holders.  Q. Is it your understanding, then, that at the completion of the statistical sampling exercise, that the statement that would be made to the account holder who is underpaid \$341 is that his stated balance is more likely than not accurate, and he would not be told he was underpaid \$341?  A. It would have to bear itself out, how the HSAs were	2 3 4 00:12:37 5 6 7 8 9 00:12:56 10 11 12 13 14 00:13:09 15 16 17 18	that sampling accounts would be problematic, because there's a likelihood, a reasonable likelihood that there would be an error in one of the transactions in the account. So as a matter of fact, early on in this process, when there were discussions about sampling accounts, sampling transactions, and they were weighing out the strengths and weaknesses, it was specifically articulated that even if you have very, very low error rates in the transactions, which is really contrary to what you would assume given all of the other reports from accountants and GAO, but if you assume it was going to be a very low transaction error rate, by the time you lumped all of those transactions into an account, what you're going to end up with was a high likelihood that you're going on have the account balance misstated.  So looking at the transactions, let's say you assume there's only 1 percent error rate. Given the average size of these accounts, by the time you look at each account and say okay, there's a 1 percent chance that transaction's wrong, 1
2 3 4 00:09:33 5 6 7 8 9 00:09:52 10 11 12 13 14 00:10:12 15 16 17 18 19	And this goes directly to my notion of sample design. It's irrelevant, the last part of that sentence is irrelevant to an individual account holder. It makes perfect sense in estimating exposure from liability in a litigation setting, but if I'm the individual that was underpaid \$341, just take this example, if someone else was overpaid \$853, that's irrelevant to me. You can't offset those transactions.  And the sample design and what was reported in the sampling really gets this notion of the net. That's the way it's reported by the accountants, that's the way it's reported in the 2007 Plan, and that netting is inappropriate in the context of trying to answer the question for individual account holders.  Q. Is it your understanding, then, that at the completion of the statistical sampling exercise, that the statement that would be made to the account holder who is underpaid \$341 is that his stated balance is more likely than not accurate, and he would not be told he was underpaid \$341?  A. It would have to bear itself out, how the HSAs were developed. But from what I've seen so far, it would be that	2 3 4 00:12:37 5 6 7 8 9 00:12:56 10 11 12 13 14 00:13:09 15 16 17 18 19	that sampling accounts would be problematic, because there's a likelihood, a reasonable likelihood that there would be an error in one of the transactions in the account. So as a matter of fact, early on in this process, when there were discussions about sampling accounts, sampling transactions, and they were weighing out the strengths and weaknesses, it was specifically articulated that even if you have very, very low error rates in the transactions, which is really contrary to what you would assume given all of the other reports from accountants and GAO, but if you assume it was going to be a very low transaction error rate, by the time you lumped all of those transactions into an account, what you're going to end up with was a high likelihood that you're going on have the account balance misstated.  So looking at the transactions, let's say you assume there's only 1 percent error rate. Given the average size of these accounts, by the time you look at each account and say okay, there's a 1 percent chance that transaction's wrong, 1 percent chance that transaction's wrong, by the time you get to
2 3 4 00:09:33 5 6 7 8 9 00:09:52 10 11 12 13 14 00:10:12 15 16 17 18 19 00:10:34 20	And this goes directly to my notion of sample design. It's irrelevant, the last part of that sentence is irrelevant to an individual account holder. It makes perfect sense in estimating exposure from liability in a litigation setting, but if I'm the individual that was underpaid \$341, just take this example, if someone else was overpaid \$853, that's irrelevant to me. You can't offset those transactions.  And the sample design and what was reported in the sampling really gets this notion of the net. That's the way it's reported by the accountants, that's the way it's reported in the 2007 Plan, and that netting is inappropriate in the context of trying to answer the question for individual account holders.  Q. Is it your understanding, then, that at the completion of the statistical sampling exercise, that the statement that would be made to the account holder who is underpaid \$341 is that his stated balance is more likely than not accurate, and he would not be told he was underpaid \$341?  A. It would have to bear itself out, how the HSAs were developed. But from what I've seen so far, it would be that your recorded transactions are probably right. They might be	2 3 4 00:12:37 5 6 7 8 9 00:12:56 10 11 12 13 14 00:13:09 15 16 17 18 19 00:13:25 20	that sampling accounts would be problematic, because there's a likelihood, a reasonable likelihood that there would be an error in one of the transactions in the account. So as a matter of fact, early on in this process, when there were discussions about sampling accounts, sampling transactions, and they were weighing out the strengths and weaknesses, it was specifically articulated that even if you have very, very low error rates in the transactions, which is really contrary to what you would assume given all of the other reports from accountants and GAO, but if you assume it was going to be a very low transaction error rate, by the time you lumped all of those transactions into an account, what you're going to end up with was a high likelihood that you're going on have the account balance misstated.  So looking at the transactions, let's say you assume there's only 1 percent error rate. Given the average size of these accounts, by the time you look at each account and say okay, there's a 1 percent chance that transaction's wrong, 1 percent chance that transaction's wrong, by the time you get to the end of all the transactions in that account, even
2 3 4 00:09:33 5 6 7 8 9 00:09:52 10 11 12 13 14 00:10:12 15 16 17 18 19 00:10:34 20 21	And this goes directly to my notion of sample design. It's irrelevant, the last part of that sentence is irrelevant to an individual account holder. It makes perfect sense in estimating exposure from liability in a litigation setting, but if I'm the individual that was underpaid \$341, just take this example, if someone else was overpaid \$853, that's irrelevant to me. You can't offset those transactions.  And the sample design and what was reported in the sampling really gets this notion of the net. That's the way it's reported by the accountants, that's the way it's reported in the 2007 Plan, and that netting is inappropriate in the context of trying to answer the question for individual account holders.  Q. Is it your understanding, then, that at the completion of the statistical sampling exercise, that the statement that would be made to the account holder who is underpaid \$341 is that his stated balance is more likely than not accurate, and he would not be told he was underpaid \$341?  A. It would have to bear itself out, how the HSAs were developed. But from what I've seen so far, it would be that your recorded transactions are probably right. They might be off by 1 percent, 4 percent, depending on credits or debits.	2 3 4 00:12:37 5 6 7 8 9 00:12:56 10 11 12 13 14 00:13:09 15 16 17 18 19 00:13:25 20 21	that sampling accounts would be problematic, because there's a likelihood, a reasonable likelihood that there would be an error in one of the transactions in the account. So as a matter of fact, early on in this process, when there were discussions about sampling accounts, sampling transactions, and they were weighing out the strengths and weaknesses, it was specifically articulated that even if you have very, very low error rates in the transactions, which is really contrary to what you would assume given all of the other reports from accountants and GAO, but if you assume it was going to be a very low transaction error rate, by the time you lumped all of those transactions into an account, what you're going to end up with was a high likelihood that you're going on have the account balance misstated.  So looking at the transactions, let's say you assume there's only 1 percent error rate. Given the average size of these accounts, by the time you look at each account and say okay, there's a 1 percent chance that transaction's wrong, 1 percent chance that transaction's wrong, by the time you get to the end of all the transactions in that account, even assuming a 1 percent error rate, you would say you can be 75
2 3 4 00:09:33 5 6 7 8 9 00:09:52 10 11 12 13 14 00:10:12 15 16 17 18 19 00:10:34 20 21 22	And this goes directly to my notion of sample design. It's irrelevant, the last part of that sentence is irrelevant to an individual account holder. It makes perfect sense in estimating exposure from liability in a litigation setting, but if I'm the individual that was underpaid \$341, just take this example, if someone else was overpaid \$853, that's irrelevant to me. You can't offset those transactions.  And the sample design and what was reported in the sampling really gets this notion of the net. That's the way it's reported by the accountants, that's the way it's reported in the 2007 Plan, and that netting is inappropriate in the context of trying to answer the question for individual account holders.  Q. Is it your understanding, then, that at the completion of the statistical sampling exercise, that the statement that would be made to the account holder who is underpaid \$341 is that his stated balance is more likely than not accurate, and he would not be told he was underpaid \$341?  A. It would have to bear itself out, how the HSAs were developed. But from what I've seen so far, it would be that your recorded transactions are probably right. They might be off by 1 percent, 4 percent, depending on credits or debits.  But the individual that was underpaid the 341, from what I've	2 3 4 00:12:37 5 6 7 8 9 00:12:56 10 11 12 13 14 00:13:09 15 16 17 18 19 00:13:25 20 21 22	that sampling accounts would be problematic, because there's a likelihood, a reasonable likelihood that there would be an error in one of the transactions in the account. So as a matter of fact, early on in this process, when there were discussions about sampling accounts, sampling transactions, and they were weighing out the strengths and weaknesses, it was specifically articulated that even if you have very, very low error rates in the transactions, which is really contrary to what you would assume given all of the other reports from accountants and GAO, but if you assume it was going to be a very low transaction error rate, by the time you lumped all of those transactions into an account, what you're going to end up with was a high likelihood that you're going on have the account balance misstated.  So looking at the transactions, let's say you assume there's only 1 percent error rate. Given the average size of these accounts, by the time you look at each account and say okay, there's a 1 percent chance that transaction's wrong, 1 percent chance that transaction's wrong, by the time you get to the end of all the transactions in that account, even assuming a 1 percent error rate, you would say you can be 75 percent sure that account balance is misstated.
2 3 4 00:09:33 5 6 7 8 9 00:09:52 10 11 12 13 14 00:10:12 15 16 17 18 19 00:10:34 20 21 22 23	And this goes directly to my notion of sample design. It's irrelevant, the last part of that sentence is irrelevant to an individual account holder. It makes perfect sense in estimating exposure from liability in a litigation setting, but if I'm the individual that was underpaid \$341, just take this example, if someone else was overpaid \$853, that's irrelevant to me. You can't offset those transactions.  And the sample design and what was reported in the sampling really gets this notion of the net. That's the way it's reported by the accountants, that's the way it's reported in the 2007 Plan, and that netting is inappropriate in the context of trying to answer the question for individual account holders.  Q. Is it your understanding, then, that at the completion of the statistical sampling exercise, that the statement that would be made to the account holder who is underpaid \$341 is that his stated balance is more likely than not accurate, and he would not be told he was underpaid \$341?  A. It would have to bear itself out, how the HSAs were developed. But from what I've seen so far, it would be that your recorded transactions are probably right. They might be off by 1 percent, 4 percent, depending on credits or debits.  But the individual that was underpaid the 341, from what I've seen so far, the only answer would be it's probably right within	2 3 4 00:12:37 5 6 7 8 9 00:12:56 10 11 12 13 14 00:13:09 15 16 17 18 19 00:13:25 20 21 22 23	that sampling accounts would be problematic, because there's a likelihood, a reasonable likelihood that there would be an error in one of the transactions in the account. So as a matter of fact, early on in this process, when there were discussions about sampling accounts, sampling transactions, and they were weighing out the strengths and weaknesses, it was specifically articulated that even if you have very, very low error rates in the transactions, which is really contrary to what you would assume given all of the other reports from accountants and GAO, but if you assume it was going to be a very low transaction error rate, by the time you lumped all of those transactions into an account, what you're going to end up with was a high likelihood that you're going on have the account balance misstated.  So looking at the transactions, let's say you assume there's only 1 percent error rate. Given the average size of these accounts, by the time you look at each account and say okay, there's a 1 percent chance that transaction's wrong, 1 percent chance that transaction's wrong, by the time you get to the end of all the transactions in that account, even assuming a 1 percent error rate, you would say you can be 75 percent sure that account balance is misstated.  If the error rate goes up at all, to 2 percent or 3
2 3 4 00:09:33 5 6 7 8 9 00:09:52 10 11 12 13 14 00:10:12 15 16 17 18 19 00:10:34 20 21 22	And this goes directly to my notion of sample design. It's irrelevant, the last part of that sentence is irrelevant to an individual account holder. It makes perfect sense in estimating exposure from liability in a litigation setting, but if I'm the individual that was underpaid \$341, just take this example, if someone else was overpaid \$853, that's irrelevant to me. You can't offset those transactions.  And the sample design and what was reported in the sampling really gets this notion of the net. That's the way it's reported by the accountants, that's the way it's reported in the 2007 Plan, and that netting is inappropriate in the context of trying to answer the question for individual account holders.  Q. Is it your understanding, then, that at the completion of the statistical sampling exercise, that the statement that would be made to the account holder who is underpaid \$341 is that his stated balance is more likely than not accurate, and he would not be told he was underpaid \$341?  A. It would have to bear itself out, how the HSAs were developed. But from what I've seen so far, it would be that your recorded transactions are probably right. They might be off by 1 percent, 4 percent, depending on credits or debits.  But the individual that was underpaid the 341, from what I've	2 3 4 00:12:37 5 6 7 8 9 00:12:56 10 11 12 13 14 00:13:09 15 16 17 18 19 00:13:25 20 21 22	that sampling accounts would be problematic, because there's a likelihood, a reasonable likelihood that there would be an error in one of the transactions in the account. So as a matter of fact, early on in this process, when there were discussions about sampling accounts, sampling transactions, and they were weighing out the strengths and weaknesses, it was specifically articulated that even if you have very, very low error rates in the transactions, which is really contrary to what you would assume given all of the other reports from accountants and GAO, but if you assume it was going to be a very low transaction error rate, by the time you lumped all of those transactions into an account, what you're going to end up with was a high likelihood that you're going on have the account balance misstated.  So looking at the transactions, let's say you assume there's only 1 percent error rate. Given the average size of these accounts, by the time you look at each account and say okay, there's a 1 percent chance that transaction's wrong, 1 percent chance that transaction's wrong, by the time you get to the end of all the transactions in that account, even assuming a 1 percent error rate, you would say you can be 75 percent sure that account balance is misstated.

Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR

Official Court Reporter

Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR

Official Court Reporter

	1416		1418
1	looking at. You shouldn't be looking at transactions. Really	1	THE COURT: It's also unidentified, isn't it?
2	what should be done here, if you were going to go through this	2	MR. GINGOLD: Yes, it is. But it was in the
3	sampling exercise, is it should be done on an account basis.	3	administrative record, Your Honor. It's identified with an HTA
4	But the lack of information really tied their hands and they	4	Bates stamp number. We assume it's something that was either
00:13:58 5	weren't able to do that.	00:17:14 5	considered or relied on in making a decision because it was part
6	Q. Let's take a look at an exhibit from the administrative	6	of the record.
7	record, and it's identified as Bates No. 11501. Do you recall	7	THE COURT: All right. Go ahead.
8	reviewing this document?	8	•
9	5	9	BY MR. GINGOLD:
00:14:18 10	A. Yes, I do.	00:17:29 10	Q. In the middle of the page on Bates No. 3, we have
	Q. As you can see, this is a November 24, 2002, document		highlighted a section. And you've discussed the problem of
11	that's identified as draft from the Office of Historical Trust	11	missing records, correct?
12	Accounting, and the headnote is "Statistical sampling strategy,"	12	A. Yes.
13	and underneath that is "the scientific logic of using sampling	13	Q. And you've discussed the errors associated with that.
14	approaches." Is that correct?	14	A. I have.
00:14:37 15	A. Yes.	00:17:41 15	<b>Q.</b> The highlighted section of this document specifically
16	Q. I'd like you to turn to what is Bates page No. 4 of this	16	states, "This warns us that we need to have a strategy that
17	document, and I'd like you to focus in on the second paragraph.	17	resolves the missing record problem for disbursements in a way
18	It's highlighted. What you've been discussing with regard to	18	that does not treat the failure to find the supporting
19	the concern about error rate in an account versus error rate in	19	documentation as an error in the account."
00:14:59 <b>20</b>	the transaction, is the highlighted section one of the concerns	00:18:01 <b>20</b>	Now, what is your understanding of that statement?
21	that you've had?	21	A. Well, this goes to the notion of the sample size
22	A. Yes. This articulates exactly what I was talking about.	22	determination and what really the exercise is trying to
23	It assumes a much, much a tenth of the error rate I was just	23	accomplish. At this point in time, it's referencing this 1972
24	talking about. Here assuming that 0.1 percent of the	24	to '92 tribal reconciliation. This was the reconciliation I
00:15:23 <b>25</b>	transactions are wrong, the account error rate would explode	00:18:19 <b>25</b>	understand that was performed by Arthur Andersen.
	Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR		Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
	Official Court Reporter		Official Court Reporter
_	1417	_	1419
1	1417 upwards of 30 percent. The example I gave was if you assume it	1	1419  I've reviewed that tribal reconciliation. And the tribal
2		2	
_	upwards of 30 percent. The example I gave was if you assume it	_	I've reviewed that tribal reconciliation. And the tribal
2	upwards of 30 percent. The example I gave was if you assume it was 1 percent error rate, it would balloon up to 75. So this is	2	I've reviewed that tribal reconciliation. And the tribal reconciliation found that even after making a whole series of
2 3 4 00:15:38 5	upwards of 30 percent. The example I gave was if you assume it was 1 percent error rate, it would balloon up to 75. So this is exactly the issue that I was talking about, and it was	2 3 4 00:18:37 <b>5</b>	I've reviewed that tribal reconciliation. And the tribal reconciliation found that even after making a whole series of amendments to the standard by which they were, quote,
2 3 4 00:15:38 5 6	upwards of 30 percent. The example I gave was if you assume it was 1 percent error rate, it would balloon up to 75. So this is exactly the issue that I was talking about, and it was identified fairly early in the sampling exercise, as we see	2 3 4 00:18:37 5 6	I've reviewed that tribal reconciliation. And the tribal reconciliation found that even after making a whole series of amendments to the standard by which they were, quote, reconciling transactions, I believe they started out at GAAP and
2 3 4 00:15:38 5 6 7	upwards of 30 percent. The example I gave was if you assume it was 1 percent error rate, it would balloon up to 75. So this is exactly the issue that I was talking about, and it was identified fairly early in the sampling exercise, as we see here, by the Office of Trust Accounting document.	2 3 4 00:18:37 5 6 7	I've reviewed that tribal reconciliation. And the tribal reconciliation found that even after making a whole series of amendments to the standard by which they were, quote, reconciling transactions, I believe they started out at GAAP and GAAS standards, and after a series of nearly a hundred
2 3 4 00:15:38 5 6 7 8	upwards of 30 percent. The example I gave was if you assume it was 1 percent error rate, it would balloon up to 75. So this is exactly the issue that I was talking about, and it was identified fairly early in the sampling exercise, as we see here, by the Office of Trust Accounting document.  Q. So is it fair to say that if the goal was to substantiate a	2 3 4 00:18:37 5 6 7 8	I've reviewed that tribal reconciliation. And the tribal reconciliation found that even after making a whole series of amendments to the standard by which they were, quote, reconciling transactions, I believe they started out at GAAP and GAAS standards, and after a series of nearly a hundred modifications to their work order, at the end of the day they
2 3 4 00:15:38 5 6 7 8 9	upwards of 30 percent. The example I gave was if you assume it was 1 percent error rate, it would balloon up to 75. So this is exactly the issue that I was talking about, and it was identified fairly early in the sampling exercise, as we see here, by the Office of Trust Accounting document.  Q. So is it fair to say that if the goal was to substantiate a near zero error rate, sampling accounts would not allow you to	2 3 4 00:18:37 5 6 7 8 9	I've reviewed that tribal reconciliation. And the tribal reconciliation found that even after making a whole series of amendments to the standard by which they were, quote, reconciling transactions, I believe they started out at GAAP and GAAS standards, and after a series of nearly a hundred modifications to their work order, at the end of the day they arrived with what the BIA instructed them was the standard to
2 3 4 00:15:38 5 6 7 8 9 00:15:54 10	upwards of 30 percent. The example I gave was if you assume it was 1 percent error rate, it would balloon up to 75. So this is exactly the issue that I was talking about, and it was identified fairly early in the sampling exercise, as we see here, by the Office of Trust Accounting document.  Q. So is it fair to say that if the goal was to substantiate a near zero error rate, sampling accounts would not allow you to reach that goal?	2 3 4 00:18:37 5 6 7 8 9 00:18:51 10	I've reviewed that tribal reconciliation. And the tribal reconciliation found that even after making a whole series of amendments to the standard by which they were, quote, reconciling transactions, I believe they started out at GAAP and GAAS standards, and after a series of nearly a hundred modifications to their work order, at the end of the day they arrived with what the BIA instructed them was the standard to which it should be reconciled.
2 3 4 00:15:38 5 6 7 8 9 00:15:54 10 11	upwards of 30 percent. The example I gave was if you assume it was 1 percent error rate, it would balloon up to 75. So this is exactly the issue that I was talking about, and it was identified fairly early in the sampling exercise, as we see here, by the Office of Trust Accounting document.  Q. So is it fair to say that if the goal was to substantiate a near zero error rate, sampling accounts would not allow you to reach that goal?  A. You could establish a very small error rate for the	2 3 4 00:18:37 5 6 7 8 9 00:18:51 10	I've reviewed that tribal reconciliation. And the tribal reconciliation found that even after making a whole series of amendments to the standard by which they were, quote, reconciling transactions, I believe they started out at GAAP and GAAS standards, and after a series of nearly a hundred modifications to their work order, at the end of the day they arrived with what the BIA instructed them was the standard to which it should be reconciled.  Even after lowering that standard all the way down, they
2 3 4 00:15:38 5 6 7 8 9 00:15:54 10 11	upwards of 30 percent. The example I gave was if you assume it was 1 percent error rate, it would balloon up to 75. So this is exactly the issue that I was talking about, and it was identified fairly early in the sampling exercise, as we see here, by the Office of Trust Accounting document.  Q. So is it fair to say that if the goal was to substantiate a near zero error rate, sampling accounts would not allow you to reach that goal?  A. You could establish a very small error rate for the transactions, potentially, but it would not result in a high	2 3 4 00:18:37 5 6 7 8 9 00:18:51 10 11	I've reviewed that tribal reconciliation. And the tribal reconciliation found that even after making a whole series of amendments to the standard by which they were, quote, reconciling transactions, I believe they started out at GAAP and GAAS standards, and after a series of nearly a hundred modifications to their work order, at the end of the day they arrived with what the BIA instructed them was the standard to which it should be reconciled.  Even after lowering that standard all the way down, they still had a substantial proportion of the documents that they
2 3 4 00:15:38 5 6 7 8 9 00:15:54 10 11 12 13	upwards of 30 percent. The example I gave was if you assume it was 1 percent error rate, it would balloon up to 75. So this is exactly the issue that I was talking about, and it was identified fairly early in the sampling exercise, as we see here, by the Office of Trust Accounting document.  Q. So is it fair to say that if the goal was to substantiate a near zero error rate, sampling accounts would not allow you to reach that goal?  A. You could establish a very small error rate for the transactions, potentially, but it would not result in a high likelihood that the account balances are correct.	2 3 4 00:18:37 5 6 7 8 9 00:18:51 10 11 12 13	I've reviewed that tribal reconciliation. And the tribal reconciliation found that even after making a whole series of amendments to the standard by which they were, quote, reconciling transactions, I believe they started out at GAAP and GAAS standards, and after a series of nearly a hundred modifications to their work order, at the end of the day they arrived with what the BIA instructed them was the standard to which it should be reconciled.  Even after lowering that standard all the way down, they still had a substantial proportion of the documents that they couldn't reconcile, that had missing supporting documentation.
2 3 4 00:15:38 5 6 7 8 9 00:15:54 10 11 12 13 14	upwards of 30 percent. The example I gave was if you assume it was 1 percent error rate, it would balloon up to 75. So this is exactly the issue that I was talking about, and it was identified fairly early in the sampling exercise, as we see here, by the Office of Trust Accounting document.  Q. So is it fair to say that if the goal was to substantiate a near zero error rate, sampling accounts would not allow you to reach that goal?  A. You could establish a very small error rate for the transactions, potentially, but it would not result in a high likelihood that the account balances are correct.  Q. Now, is the determination of an error rate part of	2 3 4 00:18:37 5 6 7 8 9 00:18:51 10 11 12 13	I've reviewed that tribal reconciliation. And the tribal reconciliation found that even after making a whole series of amendments to the standard by which they were, quote, reconciling transactions, I believe they started out at GAAP and GAAS standards, and after a series of nearly a hundred modifications to their work order, at the end of the day they arrived with what the BIA instructed them was the standard to which it should be reconciled.  Even after lowering that standard all the way down, they still had a substantial proportion of the documents that they couldn't reconcile, that had missing supporting documentation. If that was the case, and it was something in the 12 or 13
2 3 4 00:15:38 5 6 7 8 9 00:15:54 10 11 12 13 14 00:16:12 15	upwards of 30 percent. The example I gave was if you assume it was 1 percent error rate, it would balloon up to 75. So this is exactly the issue that I was talking about, and it was identified fairly early in the sampling exercise, as we see here, by the Office of Trust Accounting document.  Q. So is it fair to say that if the goal was to substantiate a near zero error rate, sampling accounts would not allow you to reach that goal?  A. You could establish a very small error rate for the transactions, potentially, but it would not result in a high likelihood that the account balances are correct.  Q. Now, is the determination of an error rate part of Defendants' accounting efforts?	2 3 4 00:18:37 5 6 7 8 9 00:18:51 10 11 12 13	I've reviewed that tribal reconciliation. And the tribal reconciliation found that even after making a whole series of amendments to the standard by which they were, quote, reconciling transactions, I believe they started out at GAAP and GAAS standards, and after a series of nearly a hundred modifications to their work order, at the end of the day they arrived with what the BIA instructed them was the standard to which it should be reconciled.  Even after lowering that standard all the way down, they still had a substantial proportion of the documents that they couldn't reconcile, that had missing supporting documentation. If that was the case, and it was something in the 12 or 13 percent neighborhood that they could not reconcile, that would
2 3 4 00:15:38 5 6 7 8 9 00:15:54 10 11 12 13 14 00:16:12 15 16	upwards of 30 percent. The example I gave was if you assume it was 1 percent error rate, it would balloon up to 75. So this is exactly the issue that I was talking about, and it was identified fairly early in the sampling exercise, as we see here, by the Office of Trust Accounting document.  Q. So is it fair to say that if the goal was to substantiate a near zero error rate, sampling accounts would not allow you to reach that goal?  A. You could establish a very small error rate for the transactions, potentially, but it would not result in a high likelihood that the account balances are correct.  Q. Now, is the determination of an error rate part of Defendants' accounting efforts?  A. It is. And we keep coming back to this notion because it	2 3 4 00:18:37 5 6 7 8 9 00:18:51 10 11 12 13 14 00:19:12 15 16	I've reviewed that tribal reconciliation. And the tribal reconciliation found that even after making a whole series of amendments to the standard by which they were, quote, reconciling transactions, I believe they started out at GAAP and GAAS standards, and after a series of nearly a hundred modifications to their work order, at the end of the day they arrived with what the BIA instructed them was the standard to which it should be reconciled.  Even after lowering that standard all the way down, they still had a substantial proportion of the documents that they couldn't reconcile, that had missing supporting documentation. If that was the case, and it was something in the 12 or 13 percent neighborhood that they could not reconcile, that would be a huge implication on the sampling exercise, because if you
2 3 4 00:15:38 5 6 7 8 9 00:15:54 10 11 12 13 14 00:16:12 15 16 17	upwards of 30 percent. The example I gave was if you assume it was 1 percent error rate, it would balloon up to 75. So this is exactly the issue that I was talking about, and it was identified fairly early in the sampling exercise, as we see here, by the Office of Trust Accounting document.  Q. So is it fair to say that if the goal was to substantiate a near zero error rate, sampling accounts would not allow you to reach that goal?  A. You could establish a very small error rate for the transactions, potentially, but it would not result in a high likelihood that the account balances are correct.  Q. Now, is the determination of an error rate part of Defendants' accounting efforts?  A. It is. And we keep coming back to this notion because it underpins everything. What is the error rate? And that is	00:18:37 5 6 7 8 9 00:18:51 10 11 12 13 14 00:19:12 15 16 17	I've reviewed that tribal reconciliation. And the tribal reconciliation found that even after making a whole series of amendments to the standard by which they were, quote, reconciling transactions, I believe they started out at GAAP and GAAS standards, and after a series of nearly a hundred modifications to their work order, at the end of the day they arrived with what the BIA instructed them was the standard to which it should be reconciled.  Even after lowering that standard all the way down, they still had a substantial proportion of the documents that they couldn't reconcile, that had missing supporting documentation. If that was the case, and it was something in the 12 or 13 percent neighborhood that they could not reconcile, that would be a huge implication on the sampling exercise, because if you assume a 13 percent error rate, if you treat all of those
2 3 4 00:15:38 5 6 7 8 9 00:15:54 10 11 12 13 14 00:16:12 15 16 17 18	upwards of 30 percent. The example I gave was if you assume it was 1 percent error rate, it would balloon up to 75. So this is exactly the issue that I was talking about, and it was identified fairly early in the sampling exercise, as we see here, by the Office of Trust Accounting document.  Q. So is it fair to say that if the goal was to substantiate a near zero error rate, sampling accounts would not allow you to reach that goal?  A. You could establish a very small error rate for the transactions, potentially, but it would not result in a high likelihood that the account balances are correct.  Q. Now, is the determination of an error rate part of Defendants' accounting efforts?  A. It is. And we keep coming back to this notion because it underpins everything. What is the error rate? And that is defined by what is the error. So it's very important to	2 3 4 00:18:37 5 6 7 8 9 00:18:51 10 11 12 13 14 00:19:12 15 16 17 18	I've reviewed that tribal reconciliation. And the tribal reconciliation found that even after making a whole series of amendments to the standard by which they were, quote, reconciling transactions, I believe they started out at GAAP and GAAS standards, and after a series of nearly a hundred modifications to their work order, at the end of the day they arrived with what the BIA instructed them was the standard to which it should be reconciled.  Even after lowering that standard all the way down, they still had a substantial proportion of the documents that they couldn't reconcile, that had missing supporting documentation. If that was the case, and it was something in the 12 or 13 percent neighborhood that they could not reconcile, that would be a huge implication on the sampling exercise, because if you assume a 13 percent error rate, if you treat all of those unreconciled as errors, then the sample size grows well, not
2 3 4 00:15:38 5 6 7 8 9 00:15:54 10 11 12 13 14 00:16:12 15 16 17	upwards of 30 percent. The example I gave was if you assume it was 1 percent error rate, it would balloon up to 75. So this is exactly the issue that I was talking about, and it was identified fairly early in the sampling exercise, as we see here, by the Office of Trust Accounting document.  Q. So is it fair to say that if the goal was to substantiate a near zero error rate, sampling accounts would not allow you to reach that goal?  A. You could establish a very small error rate for the transactions, potentially, but it would not result in a high likelihood that the account balances are correct.  Q. Now, is the determination of an error rate part of Defendants' accounting efforts?  A. It is. And we keep coming back to this notion because it underpins everything. What is the error rate? And that is defined by what is the error. So it's very important to understand what that error rate is and what comprises that error	00:18:37 5 6 7 8 9 00:18:51 10 11 12 13 14 00:19:12 15 16 17	I've reviewed that tribal reconciliation. And the tribal reconciliation found that even after making a whole series of amendments to the standard by which they were, quote, reconciling transactions, I believe they started out at GAAP and GAAS standards, and after a series of nearly a hundred modifications to their work order, at the end of the day they arrived with what the BIA instructed them was the standard to which it should be reconciled.  Even after lowering that standard all the way down, they still had a substantial proportion of the documents that they couldn't reconcile, that had missing supporting documentation. If that was the case, and it was something in the 12 or 13 percent neighborhood that they could not reconcile, that would be a huge implication on the sampling exercise, because if you assume a 13 percent error rate, if you treat all of those unreconciled as errors, then the sample size grows well, not even proportionally, it would grow even faster than that.
2 3 4 00:15:38 5 6 7 8 9 00:15:54 10 11 12 13 14 00:16:12 15 16 17 18	upwards of 30 percent. The example I gave was if you assume it was 1 percent error rate, it would balloon up to 75. So this is exactly the issue that I was talking about, and it was identified fairly early in the sampling exercise, as we see here, by the Office of Trust Accounting document.  Q. So is it fair to say that if the goal was to substantiate a near zero error rate, sampling accounts would not allow you to reach that goal?  A. You could establish a very small error rate for the transactions, potentially, but it would not result in a high likelihood that the account balances are correct.  Q. Now, is the determination of an error rate part of Defendants' accounting efforts?  A. It is. And we keep coming back to this notion because it underpins everything. What is the error rate? And that is defined by what is the error. So it's very important to understand what that error rate is and what comprises that error rate as part of conducting the sampling.	2 3 4 00:18:37 5 6 7 8 9 00:18:51 10 11 12 13 14 00:19:12 15 16 17 18	I've reviewed that tribal reconciliation. And the tribal reconciliation found that even after making a whole series of amendments to the standard by which they were, quote, reconciling transactions, I believe they started out at GAAP and GAAS standards, and after a series of nearly a hundred modifications to their work order, at the end of the day they arrived with what the BIA instructed them was the standard to which it should be reconciled.  Even after lowering that standard all the way down, they still had a substantial proportion of the documents that they couldn't reconcile, that had missing supporting documentation. If that was the case, and it was something in the 12 or 13 percent neighborhood that they could not reconcile, that would be a huge implication on the sampling exercise, because if you assume a 13 percent error rate, if you treat all of those unreconciled as errors, then the sample size grows well, not even proportionally, it would grow even faster than that. There's a large increase in the required sample size, and
2 3 4 00:15:38 5 6 7 8 9 00:15:54 10 11 12 13 14 00:16:12 15 16 17 18 19	upwards of 30 percent. The example I gave was if you assume it was 1 percent error rate, it would balloon up to 75. So this is exactly the issue that I was talking about, and it was identified fairly early in the sampling exercise, as we see here, by the Office of Trust Accounting document.  Q. So is it fair to say that if the goal was to substantiate a near zero error rate, sampling accounts would not allow you to reach that goal?  A. You could establish a very small error rate for the transactions, potentially, but it would not result in a high likelihood that the account balances are correct.  Q. Now, is the determination of an error rate part of Defendants' accounting efforts?  A. It is. And we keep coming back to this notion because it underpins everything. What is the error rate? And that is defined by what is the error. So it's very important to understand what that error rate is and what comprises that error rate as part of conducting the sampling.  Q. In that regard, I'd like you to turn your attention to an	2 3 4 00:18:37 5 6 7 8 9 00:18:51 10 11 12 13 14 00:19:12 15 16 17 18 19	I've reviewed that tribal reconciliation. And the tribal reconciliation found that even after making a whole series of amendments to the standard by which they were, quote, reconciling transactions, I believe they started out at GAAP and GAAS standards, and after a series of nearly a hundred modifications to their work order, at the end of the day they arrived with what the BIA instructed them was the standard to which it should be reconciled.  Even after lowering that standard all the way down, they still had a substantial proportion of the documents that they couldn't reconcile, that had missing supporting documentation. If that was the case, and it was something in the 12 or 13 percent neighborhood that they could not reconcile, that would be a huge implication on the sampling exercise, because if you assume a 13 percent error rate, if you treat all of those unreconciled as errors, then the sample size grows well, not even proportionally, it would grow even faster than that. There's a large increase in the required sample size, and there's potentially a decrease in the assurance rates that would
2 3 4 00:15:38 5 6 7 8 9 00:15:54 10 11 12 13 14 00:16:12 15 16 17 18 19 00:16:30 20	upwards of 30 percent. The example I gave was if you assume it was 1 percent error rate, it would balloon up to 75. So this is exactly the issue that I was talking about, and it was identified fairly early in the sampling exercise, as we see here, by the Office of Trust Accounting document.  Q. So is it fair to say that if the goal was to substantiate a near zero error rate, sampling accounts would not allow you to reach that goal?  A. You could establish a very small error rate for the transactions, potentially, but it would not result in a high likelihood that the account balances are correct.  Q. Now, is the determination of an error rate part of Defendants' accounting efforts?  A. It is. And we keep coming back to this notion because it underpins everything. What is the error rate? And that is defined by what is the error. So it's very important to understand what that error rate is and what comprises that error rate as part of conducting the sampling.  Q. In that regard, I'd like you to turn your attention to an exhibit, another exhibit from the administrative record. It's	00:18:37 5 6 7 8 9 00:18:51 10 11 12 13 14 00:19:12 15 16 17 18 19 00:19:29 20	I've reviewed that tribal reconciliation. And the tribal reconciliation found that even after making a whole series of amendments to the standard by which they were, quote, reconciling transactions, I believe they started out at GAAP and GAAS standards, and after a series of nearly a hundred modifications to their work order, at the end of the day they arrived with what the BIA instructed them was the standard to which it should be reconciled.  Even after lowering that standard all the way down, they still had a substantial proportion of the documents that they couldn't reconcile, that had missing supporting documentation. If that was the case, and it was something in the 12 or 13 percent neighborhood that they could not reconcile, that would be a huge implication on the sampling exercise, because if you assume a 13 percent error rate, if you treat all of those unreconciled as errors, then the sample size grows well, not even proportionally, it would grow even faster than that. There's a large increase in the required sample size, and there's potentially a decrease in the assurance rates that would be able to be provided.
2 3 4 00:15:38 5 6 7 8 9 00:15:54 10 11 12 13 14 00:16:12 15 16 17 18 19 00:16:30 20 21	upwards of 30 percent. The example I gave was if you assume it was 1 percent error rate, it would balloon up to 75. So this is exactly the issue that I was talking about, and it was identified fairly early in the sampling exercise, as we see here, by the Office of Trust Accounting document.  Q. So is it fair to say that if the goal was to substantiate a near zero error rate, sampling accounts would not allow you to reach that goal?  A. You could establish a very small error rate for the transactions, potentially, but it would not result in a high likelihood that the account balances are correct.  Q. Now, is the determination of an error rate part of Defendants' accounting efforts?  A. It is. And we keep coming back to this notion because it underpins everything. What is the error rate? And that is defined by what is the error. So it's very important to understand what that error rate is and what comprises that error rate as part of conducting the sampling.  Q. In that regard, I'd like you to turn your attention to an exhibit, another exhibit from the administrative record. It's Bates numbers 57-30-1. Have you reviewed this exhibit before?	00:18:37	I've reviewed that tribal reconciliation. And the tribal reconciliation found that even after making a whole series of amendments to the standard by which they were, quote, reconciling transactions, I believe they started out at GAAP and GAAS standards, and after a series of nearly a hundred modifications to their work order, at the end of the day they arrived with what the BIA instructed them was the standard to which it should be reconciled.  Even after lowering that standard all the way down, they still had a substantial proportion of the documents that they couldn't reconcile, that had missing supporting documentation. If that was the case, and it was something in the 12 or 13 percent neighborhood that they could not reconcile, that would be a huge implication on the sampling exercise, because if you assume a 13 percent error rate, if you treat all of those unreconciled as errors, then the sample size grows well, not even proportionally, it would grow even faster than that. There's a large increase in the required sample size, and there's potentially a decrease in the assurance rates that would be able to be provided.  So I think it's correctly identified here that if they're
2 3 4 00:15:38 5 6 7 8 9 00:15:54 10 11 12 13 14 00:16:12 15 16 17 18 19 00:16:30 20 21 22	upwards of 30 percent. The example I gave was if you assume it was 1 percent error rate, it would balloon up to 75. So this is exactly the issue that I was talking about, and it was identified fairly early in the sampling exercise, as we see here, by the Office of Trust Accounting document.  Q. So is it fair to say that if the goal was to substantiate a near zero error rate, sampling accounts would not allow you to reach that goal?  A. You could establish a very small error rate for the transactions, potentially, but it would not result in a high likelihood that the account balances are correct.  Q. Now, is the determination of an error rate part of Defendants' accounting efforts?  A. It is. And we keep coming back to this notion because it underpins everything. What is the error rate? And that is defined by what is the error. So it's very important to understand what that error rate is and what comprises that error rate as part of conducting the sampling.  Q. In that regard, I'd like you to turn your attention to an exhibit, another exhibit from the administrative record. It's Bates numbers 57-30-1. Have you reviewed this exhibit before?  A. Yes, I have.	00:18:37 5 6 7 8 9 00:18:51 10 11 12 13 14 00:19:12 15 16 17 18 19 00:19:29 20 21 22 23 24	reconciliation found that even after making a whole series of amendments to the standard by which they were, quote, reconciling transactions, I believe they started out at GAAP and GAAS standards, and after a series of nearly a hundred modifications to their work order, at the end of the day they arrived with what the BIA instructed them was the standard to which it should be reconciled.  Even after lowering that standard all the way down, they still had a substantial proportion of the documents that they couldn't reconcile, that had missing supporting documentation. If that was the case, and it was something in the 12 or 13 percent neighborhood that they could not reconcile, that would be a huge implication on the sampling exercise, because if you assume a 13 percent error rate, if you treat all of those unreconciled as errors, then the sample size grows well, not even proportionally, it would grow even faster than that. There's a large increase in the required sample size, and there's potentially a decrease in the assurance rates that would be able to be provided.  So I think it's correctly identified here that if they're going to treat these missing documents and unsupported documents
00:15:38	upwards of 30 percent. The example I gave was if you assume it was 1 percent error rate, it would balloon up to 75. So this is exactly the issue that I was talking about, and it was identified fairly early in the sampling exercise, as we see here, by the Office of Trust Accounting document.  Q. So is it fair to say that if the goal was to substantiate a near zero error rate, sampling accounts would not allow you to reach that goal?  A. You could establish a very small error rate for the transactions, potentially, but it would not result in a high likelihood that the account balances are correct.  Q. Now, is the determination of an error rate part of Defendants' accounting efforts?  A. It is. And we keep coming back to this notion because it underpins everything. What is the error rate? And that is defined by what is the error. So it's very important to understand what that error rate is and what comprises that error rate as part of conducting the sampling.  Q. In that regard, I'd like you to turn your attention to an exhibit, another exhibit from the administrative record. It's Bates numbers 57-30-1. Have you reviewed this exhibit before?  A. Yes, I have.  Q. This is entitled "Managing historical accounting records."	2 3 4 00:18:37 5 6 7 8 9 00:18:51 10 11 12 13 14 00:19:12 15 16 17 18 19 00:19:29 20 21 22 23	I've reviewed that tribal reconciliation. And the tribal reconciliation found that even after making a whole series of amendments to the standard by which they were, quote, reconciling transactions, I believe they started out at GAAP and GAAS standards, and after a series of nearly a hundred modifications to their work order, at the end of the day they arrived with what the BIA instructed them was the standard to which it should be reconciled.  Even after lowering that standard all the way down, they still had a substantial proportion of the documents that they couldn't reconcile, that had missing supporting documentation. If that was the case, and it was something in the 12 or 13 percent neighborhood that they could not reconcile, that would be a huge implication on the sampling exercise, because if you assume a 13 percent error rate, if you treat all of those unreconciled as errors, then the sample size grows well, not even proportionally, it would grow even faster than that. There's a large increase in the required sample size, and there's potentially a decrease in the assurance rates that would be able to be provided.  So I think it's correctly identified here that if they're going to treat these missing documents and unsupported documents as errors, they're going to have it would have to be a
00:15:38 5 6 7 8 9 00:15:54 10 11 12 13 14 00:16:12 15 16 17 18 19 00:16:30 20 21 22 23 24	upwards of 30 percent. The example I gave was if you assume it was 1 percent error rate, it would balloon up to 75. So this is exactly the issue that I was talking about, and it was identified fairly early in the sampling exercise, as we see here, by the Office of Trust Accounting document.  Q. So is it fair to say that if the goal was to substantiate a near zero error rate, sampling accounts would not allow you to reach that goal?  A. You could establish a very small error rate for the transactions, potentially, but it would not result in a high likelihood that the account balances are correct.  Q. Now, is the determination of an error rate part of Defendants' accounting efforts?  A. It is. And we keep coming back to this notion because it underpins everything. What is the error rate? And that is defined by what is the error. So it's very important to understand what that error rate is and what comprises that error rate as part of conducting the sampling.  Q. In that regard, I'd like you to turn your attention to an exhibit, another exhibit from the administrative record. It's Bates numbers 57-30-1. Have you reviewed this exhibit before?  A. Yes, I have.  Q. This is entitled "Managing historical accounting records."  It is undated. I'd like you to turn your attention to Bates	00:18:37 5 6 7 8 9 00:18:51 10 11 12 13 14 00:19:12 15 16 17 18 19 00:19:29 20 21 22 23 24	I've reviewed that tribal reconciliation. And the tribal reconciliation found that even after making a whole series of amendments to the standard by which they were, quote, reconciling transactions, I believe they started out at GAAP and GAAS standards, and after a series of nearly a hundred modifications to their work order, at the end of the day they arrived with what the BIA instructed them was the standard to which it should be reconciled.  Even after lowering that standard all the way down, they still had a substantial proportion of the documents that they couldn't reconcile, that had missing supporting documentation. If that was the case, and it was something in the 12 or 13 percent neighborhood that they could not reconcile, that would be a huge implication on the sampling exercise, because if you assume a 13 percent error rate, if you treat all of those unreconciled as errors, then the sample size grows well, not even proportionally, it would grow even faster than that. There's a large increase in the required sample size, and there's potentially a decrease in the assurance rates that would be able to be provided.  So I think it's correctly identified here that if they're going to treat these missing documents and unsupported documents as errors, they're going to have it would have to be a substantially different sampling exercise than what was
00:15:38 5 6 7 8 9 00:15:54 10 11 12 13 14 00:16:12 15 16 17 18 19 00:16:30 20 21 22 23 24	upwards of 30 percent. The example I gave was if you assume it was 1 percent error rate, it would balloon up to 75. So this is exactly the issue that I was talking about, and it was identified fairly early in the sampling exercise, as we see here, by the Office of Trust Accounting document.  Q. So is it fair to say that if the goal was to substantiate a near zero error rate, sampling accounts would not allow you to reach that goal?  A. You could establish a very small error rate for the transactions, potentially, but it would not result in a high likelihood that the account balances are correct.  Q. Now, is the determination of an error rate part of Defendants' accounting efforts?  A. It is. And we keep coming back to this notion because it underpins everything. What is the error rate? And that is defined by what is the error. So it's very important to understand what that error rate is and what comprises that error rate as part of conducting the sampling.  Q. In that regard, I'd like you to turn your attention to an exhibit, another exhibit from the administrative record. It's Bates numbers 57-30-1. Have you reviewed this exhibit before?  A. Yes, I have.  Q. This is entitled "Managing historical accounting records."  It is undated. I'd like you to turn your attention to Bates  No page No. 3.	00:18:37 5 6 7 8 9 00:18:51 10 11 12 13 14 00:19:12 15 16 17 18 19 00:19:29 20 21 22 23 24	I've reviewed that tribal reconciliation. And the tribal reconciliation found that even after making a whole series of amendments to the standard by which they were, quote, reconciling transactions, I believe they started out at GAAP and GAAS standards, and after a series of nearly a hundred modifications to their work order, at the end of the day they arrived with what the BIA instructed them was the standard to which it should be reconciled.  Even after lowering that standard all the way down, they still had a substantial proportion of the documents that they couldn't reconcile, that had missing supporting documentation. If that was the case, and it was something in the 12 or 13 percent neighborhood that they could not reconcile, that would be a huge implication on the sampling exercise, because if you assume a 13 percent error rate, if you treat all of those unreconciled as errors, then the sample size grows well, not even proportionally, it would grow even faster than that. There's a large increase in the required sample size, and there's potentially a decrease in the assurance rates that would be able to be provided.  So I think it's correctly identified here that if they're going to treat these missing documents and unsupported documents as errors, they're going to have it would have to be a substantially different sampling exercise than what was conducted.

	1420		1422
1	Q. Is it fair to say they wouldn't be able to achieve a near	1	highlighted A, reconciled with directly relevant documents
2	zero error rate?	2	without discrepancy, and you'll see A, B, C, D, E,
3	A. Correct. If you don't find a way to ignore those as	3	unsubstantiated. Is A consistent with your understanding of a
4	errors, you're not going to get close to a zero error rate; your	4	1-rated reconciliation?
00:19:56 <b>5</b>	expectation going in would be something in the 12, 13 percent	00:22:54 <b>5</b>	A. Well, accounting code 1 would be both A and B. There's
6	area.	6	sort of two steps to it. The first is the reconciliation. Can
7	<b>Q.</b> Is it your understanding that this particular concern on	7	we tie it back to some document that substantiates it's either
8	how to treat missing documents vis-a-vis error rate is something	8	reconciled yes or no, and then the second question is is there a
9	that was actually underscored by the Defendants in the	9	discrepancy in that reconciliation. Did we find a supporting
00:20:11 10	administrative record?	00:23:12 10	document that's different or did we find supporting documents
11	A. Yes, it was.	11	that support it. So accounting code 1 deals with A and B.
12	THE COURT: If there's no objection to that question,	12	Q. So accounting code 1 even includes documentation which may
13	I guess I'll let it stand, but this is the same document you	13	be in conflict with the posted entry, correct?
14	showed to Dr. Scheuren and he couldn't identify it. So I'm not	14	A. From the standpoint of it being reconciled, yes or no, it
00:20:27 15	taking very much from this. Go ahead.	00:23:30 15	is.
16	BY MR. GINGOLD:	16	Q. And if we look at C and D on this page, "inferred
17	Q. Let's go to Bates page 10 of the same document. And if we	17	reconciliation, strongly persuasive," and "inferred
18	can turn to the second paragraph, which is the first highlighted	18	reconciliation, persuasive to some extent," do you have an
19	paragraph on this page, you will note that that same warning	19	understanding of what C and D mean?
00:20:54 <b>20 21</b>	with regard to treating missing documents is restated, isn't it?	00:23:44 <b>20 21</b>	A. Those map in some degree into accounting code 2 and
22	A. Yes, it is.	21	possibly 1.
23	Q. And you have reviewed this entire document, have you not,  Mr. Duncan?	23	Q. But again, you don't have you haven't been able to
24	A. I have.	24	review any detail which explains the accounting codes, have you?
00:21:06 <b>25</b>	Q. Now, one of the things that you've pointed out is documents	00:24:04 <b>25</b>	Other than the ASM, but that does not tell me definitively,     and the information about the results of the sampling don't tell
00.21.06	Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR	00.24.04	Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
	Official Court Reporter		Official Court Reporter
	1421		1423
1	are resolved depending on coded numbers, correct, 1, 2, 3, and	1	you even whether or not, for accounting code 1, were they
2	4 or reconciliations are resolved	2	reconciled with a directly relevant document, or were they an
3	A. Correct. There were four codes for the reconciliation	3	inferred reconciliation. You can't tell in that bucket that's
4	efforts.	4	grouped as reconciled code 1 which of those happened.
00:21:20 <b>5</b>	Q. All right. And what is your recollection of code No. 1?	00:24:20 <b>5</b>	<b>Q.</b> And in code 2 sound judgments are permitted, correct?
6	A. It changes modestly over time, but the consistent	6	A. I believe code 1 and code 2, judgment is permitted.
7	definition of an accounting code 1 is it has a directly	7	Q. On the paragraph underneath the A, B, C, D, E descriptions,
8	supporting document, it has been recomputed using known	8	there seems to be an explanation of A through E. Did you review
9	Department of the Interior methods, or it has been substantiated	9	that before?
00:21:43 10	with third-party documentation.	00:24:40 10	A. I did.
11	<b>Q.</b> And what about a code No. 2?	11	<b>Q.</b> What is your understanding of that explanation?
12	A. Code No. 2 is this term, alternative procedure. I've	12	MR. WARSHAWSKY: Objection. This document speaks for
13	really, despite some extended efforts to try and find something	13	itself.
14	as to what that means, I've not seen anything other than it's	14	THE COURT: Thank you. I'm going to sustain the
00:22:01 15	called an alternative procedure.	00:24:48 15	objection. I tried to I mean, this is just a document that's
16	<b>Q.</b> As a matter of fact, you've reviewed portions of the	16	found in the administrative record. Nobody quite knows what it
17	administrative record, isn't it true?	17	is. I'm more interested in this witness's opinion than what he
18	A. The large majority of the administrative record I've	18	thinks of some other paper that's in the administrative record.
19	reviewed personally.	19	BY MR. GINGOLD:
00:22:12 <b>20 21</b>	Q. Did you find anything in your review of the administrative	00:25:04 <b>20 21</b>	Q. Do you believe reconciliation should be performed without
21	record which explained the alternative procedures in detail?	21	direct source documents?
23	A. Not in any detail that I could decipher what exactly was	22	MR. WARSHAWSKY: Objection. No foundation for the
23	the guidance to the individual accountant that's doing the reconciliation.	23	THE COURT: I'll allow that question I'll allow
00:22:26 <b>25</b>		00:25:18 25	THE COURT: I'll allow that question. I'll allow that.
00.22.20	() If we can do to the middle of this hade you'll see a		
	Q. If we can go to the middle of this page, you'll see a  Bryan A Wayne RPR CRR	00:25:18	
	Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR  Official Court Reporter	00:25:18	Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR Official Court Reporter

	1424		1426
1	THE WITNESS: Ultimately that's what underpins all of	1	code. Do you have an understanding of what this is?
2	the sampling exercise, is what is reconciled and what is not.	2	A. I do, and this document was very important in creating and
3	And as a statistician, if it were tasked to me to try and	3	drafting our opinions. This is the only information that was
4	perform this particular sampling exercise, it makes a huge	4	provided as part of the administrative record where we actually
00:25:32 <b>5</b>	difference whether or not something is reconciled with a	00:28:58 <b>5</b>	see what the accountants did in the process of doing the
6	directly supporting document, or whether or not it has been used	6	reconciliation.
7	through some judgment or recalculated or something like that.	7	So what we have here is for the Eastern Region, this
8	So I would not be comfortable preparing opinions or doing	8	document goes down for the 289 transactions that were sampled in
9	an extrapolation where you don't provide to the consumer of this	9	the Eastern Region, and what we see going across the line is
00:25:53 10	information what the difference was, which ones were reconciled	00:29:14 10	there's an identifier, the 001, that just identifies the
11	where there was actually back to a source document that says,	11	transaction, we can see that in the electronic ledger, this was
12	and it matched. Which ones were recomputed? Because quite	12	a \$636.82 transaction. This was reconciled, if you go all the
13	frankly, if I was looking at one that was recomputed, I'm not	13	way to the right column, you can see this is an accounting code
14	really sure that you would expect to find any error. Or one	14	1. So that tells us that this was either directly reconciled,
00:26:11 15	that is an alternative procedure. I don't know what an	00:29:36 15	recomputed, or subject to third party documentation. It was one
16	alternative procedure is, but I know what it's not. It's not	16	of those three things happened. And that reconciled to an
17	linked back to a source document, directly tied to that source	17	amount of \$636.82 with no variance.
18	document. It's not a third party document. It's not inferred	18	So for this particular transaction, it's possible, although
19	from the recomputation of the efforts.	19	we can't tell, it's possible that this had an actual transaction
00:26:26 20	So everything in accounting code 2, what that means is it's	00:29:55 <b>20</b>	that would show us exactly this is the right amount. It was a
21	something other than that, but I wouldn't really have any idea	21	lease collection or check disbursement, depending on positive or
22	why you would expect to find an error under an alternative .	22	negative, but there's this notion that you can see this is
23 24	procedure.	23 24	exactly how much came in. That's a possibility. It's also a
00:26:37 25	So when all of those get lumped together for the	00:30:10 25	possibility that it was just recomputed using some known
00:26:37 23	calculation of the error rate, in my mind that makes anything  Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR	00:30:10 23	Treasury method or Department of Interior method.
	Official Court Reporter		Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR Official Court Reporter
	1425		1427
1	based on that error rate meaningless, because you just don't	1	Now, importantly, though maybe if I can just have you
2	know how you got to this notion of there being a 1 percent error	2	pan down.
3	rate.	3	Q. Drop to let's say trans ID 48.
4	BY MR. GINGOLD:	4	A. Good. That's one example. So we can actually see here
00:26:49 <b>5</b>	Q. And specifically, is what you're saying that you as a	00:30:25 <b>5</b>	transaction 48, it's in the electronic ledger at \$162.23. It's
6	reviewer of the information would not be able to make a decision	6	also in accounting code 1. So what happened here is there must
7	as to what is an error in a particular transaction?	7	have however it worked in accounting code 1 we don't have
8	A. Correct. The entire sampling is based on this notion of	8	the work papers. I can't see whether or not there is a check or
9	the error rate, and if you don't have any understanding of what	9	there is a lease income. All we know, we have this piece of
00:27:08 10	constituted the error, or have any confidence that an error has	00:30:46 10	information. But it tells us that somehow they established that
11	a meaning other than it could be any of these other procedures	11	this particular account was off it's only off by a penny, but
12	and not be an error, it would be nearly impossible to make any	12	this transaction was off by one cent.
13	informed decision on that basis.	13	Now, that, Your Honor, perhaps to put some context to what
14	<b>Q.</b> I'd like to bring to your attention another document from	14	we were talking about before, but in answering a question in an
00:27:26 15	the administrative record. It is identified as Bates No.	00:31:05 15	attribute sample, my position would be that's an error, that's a
16	60-12-1. This is a September 22, 2003, document entitled	16	mistake. It's only a penny, but that penny would be caught in
17	"Accountant's report on the reconciliation of the Eastern Region	17	the second part of this, which is the variable calculation. We
18	land-based non-interest individual Indian money transactions."	18	can gather that up to quantify the magnitude, but it was
19	Have you reviewed this document before, Mr. Duncan?	19	recorded incorrectly.
00:27:57 20	A. Yes, I have.	00:31:19 20	For purposes of the Eastern Region, though, that
21 22	Q. I'd like you to turn your attention to Bates page 4, and	21 22	transaction was concluded that there was no error, because it
23	I'd like you to look at this through page 10. And as you can	23	fell below the de minimis rule. So this, I think, certainly
23	see on Bates 4, you have categories which are identified as trans ID, transaction amount, throughput transaction amount,	23	helped us understand when we were looking at this, exactly what was happening at the individual reconciliation level.
00:28:30 25	reconciled transaction amount, total variance, and accounting	00:31:37 25	So in the Eastern Region, you'll recall, Your Honor, it was
33.20.00		55.51.57	Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
	Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR		

	1428		1430
1	NORC's conclusion that there were no errors. There's a series	1	procedures; ergo I wouldn't expect to see an error.
2	of I believe 12 or 13 maybe 13 of these same kinds of	2	Q. I'd like you to turn to Bates 10. And if you look at the
3	mistakes that are off by very small amounts, but at the end of	3	reconciliation columns above, what does that tell you?
4	the day, NORC concluded there are no errors in this	4	A. Well, these are all accounting code 4, and I'm sure,
00:31:56 <b>5</b>	reconciliation at all.	00:34:42 <b>5</b>	Your Honor, you've seen the definitions are actually provided
6	Q. And let's turn to Bates No. 5. And if we could focus in on	6	on the bottom. Transaction 4 is there's no evidence that can be
7	the top half of this so Mr. Duncan can read this.	7	found, no alternative analyses, no alternative procedures.
8	You see there's additional variances of a penny and two	8	These are simply ones that there was no way to reconcile.
9	cents on this particular page, correct?	9	Now, there's a little bit of a twist in the Eastern Region
00:32:17 10	A. Yes.	00:34:57 10	because it was done early as part of the LSA, and the
11	Q. And again, you're unable to determine how that was	11	transactions, the \$105 to the \$200, all of those transactions
12	determined because you don't have the work papers, correct?	12	are more than a hundred dollars. Here the certainty stratum
13	A. That's correct. We do know that these are accounting code	13	that was utilized was not a hundred thousand dollars and
14	1. That tells us something about how it was reconciled, but	14	greater, but it was a hundred dollars and greater. So there was
00:32:32 15	nothing specific.	00:35:14 15	an attempt to reconcile all of these as well.
16	<b>Q.</b> Let's drop to the bottom half of the page. Were there	16	Ultimately it turns out these six transactions were not
17	additional variances identified, each of which is only a penny,	17	able to be reconciled under anything, so they were lumped into
18	correct?	18	accounting code 4. And as you can see, there's no variance
19	A. Correct.	19	associated with it, again, because you can't reconcile it, there
00:32:42 <b>20</b>	Q. I'd like to turn to page 6. If you see on page 6 there are	00:35:33 <b>20</b>	would be no expectation of being able to calculate a variance.
21	additional transactions which are identified as a penny,	21	<b>Q.</b> And is it your understanding there's a zero error rate as
22	correct?	22	determined by NORC in the Eastern Region?
23	A. Correct. I believe on this page there's also some	23	A. That's correct.
24	negatives. There's positives and negatives.	24	Q. Now, are you aware, other than you've discussed the fact
00:33:00 <b>25</b>	<b>Q.</b> Does it make a difference if it's a positive or negative	00:35:54 <b>25</b>	you haven't seen work papers which help explain how the
	Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR		Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
	Official Court Reporter		Official Court Reporter
	Cilicial Court Reporter		omout obuit reporter
	1429		1431
1	<u> </u>	1	<u>'</u>
1 2	1429	1 2	1431
-	variance?	_	1431 accounting codes have been employed, correct?
2	variance?  A. Well, this goes to the notion of the netting. At the end	2	accounting codes have been employed, correct?  A. They would be very helpful in understanding what
2 3 4 00:33:16 5	variance?  A. Well, this goes to the notion of the netting. At the end of this report, you'll see that the net variance is provided,	2 3 4 00:36:09 5	accounting codes have been employed, correct?  A. They would be very helpful in understanding what constitutes these different codes.
2 3 4 00:33:16 5 6	variance?  A. Well, this goes to the notion of the netting. At the end of this report, you'll see that the net variance is provided, and it does. It nets out the positives and negatives between	2 3 4 00:36:09 5 6	accounting codes have been employed, correct?  A. They would be very helpful in understanding what constitutes these different codes.  Q. Is there any other evidence in the administrative record
2 3 4 00:33:16 5 6 7	variance?  A. Well, this goes to the notion of the netting. At the end of this report, you'll see that the net variance is provided, and it does. It nets out the positives and negatives between these transactions.  Q. What I'd like you to turn your attention to now is Bates  No. 9. And let's just focus on the top half of this first so	2 3 4 00:36:09 5 6 7	accounting codes have been employed, correct?  A. They would be very helpful in understanding what constitutes these different codes.  Q. Is there any other evidence in the administrative record that you've reviewed that helps you understand what the error
2 3 4 00:33:16 5 6 7 8	variance?  A. Well, this goes to the notion of the netting. At the end of this report, you'll see that the net variance is provided, and it does. It nets out the positives and negatives between these transactions.  Q. What I'd like you to turn your attention to now is Bates	2 3 4 00:36:09 5 6 7 8	accounting codes have been employed, correct?  A. They would be very helpful in understanding what constitutes these different codes.  Q. Is there any other evidence in the administrative record that you've reviewed that helps you understand what the error rates are?
2 3 4 00:33:16 5 6 7 8 9	variance?  A. Well, this goes to the notion of the netting. At the end of this report, you'll see that the net variance is provided, and it does. It nets out the positives and negatives between these transactions.  Q. What I'd like you to turn your attention to now is Bates  No. 9. And let's just focus on the top half of this first so it's more easily readable. You note that these reconciliations are done in accordance with accounting code 2?	2 3 4 00:36:09 5 6 7 8 9	accounting codes have been employed, correct?  A. They would be very helpful in understanding what constitutes these different codes.  Q. Is there any other evidence in the administrative record that you've reviewed that helps you understand what the error rates are?  A. Well, there's the inclusion at the beginning of the Eastern Region, there's a discussion as to what the error rates you know, that there were no error rates there was a no error
2 3 4 00:33:16 5 6 7 8 9 00:33:35	variance?  A. Well, this goes to the notion of the netting. At the end of this report, you'll see that the net variance is provided, and it does. It nets out the positives and negatives between these transactions.  Q. What I'd like you to turn your attention to now is Bates No. 9. And let's just focus on the top half of this first so it's more easily readable. You note that these reconciliations are done in accordance with accounting code 2?  A. Correct. There are I believe 42 that were accounting code	2 3 4 00:36:09 5 6 7 8 9 00:36:31 10	accounting codes have been employed, correct?  A. They would be very helpful in understanding what constitutes these different codes.  Q. Is there any other evidence in the administrative record that you've reviewed that helps you understand what the error rates are?  A. Well, there's the inclusion at the beginning of the Eastern Region, there's a discussion as to what the error rates you know, that there were no error rates there was a no error rate conclusion with respect to this particular project with the
2 3 4 00:33:16 5 6 7 8 9 00:33:35 10	variance?  A. Well, this goes to the notion of the netting. At the end of this report, you'll see that the net variance is provided, and it does. It nets out the positives and negatives between these transactions.  Q. What I'd like you to turn your attention to now is Bates  No. 9. And let's just focus on the top half of this first so it's more easily readable. You note that these reconciliations are done in accordance with accounting code 2?  A. Correct. There are I believe 42 that were accounting code 2 in this sample.	2 3 4 00:36:09 5 6 7 8 9 00:36:31 10	accounting codes have been employed, correct?  A. They would be very helpful in understanding what constitutes these different codes.  Q. Is there any other evidence in the administrative record that you've reviewed that helps you understand what the error rates are?  A. Well, there's the inclusion at the beginning of the Eastern Region, there's a discussion as to what the error rates you know, that there were no error rates there was a no error rate conclusion with respect to this particular project with the Eastern Region.
2 3 4 00:33:16 5 6 7 8 9 00:33:35 10 11	variance?  A. Well, this goes to the notion of the netting. At the end of this report, you'll see that the net variance is provided, and it does. It nets out the positives and negatives between these transactions.  Q. What I'd like you to turn your attention to now is Bates  No. 9. And let's just focus on the top half of this first so it's more easily readable. You note that these reconciliations are done in accordance with accounting code 2?  A. Correct. There are I believe 42 that were accounting code 2 in this sample.  Q. But there's no variance?	2 3 4 00:36:09 5 6 7 8 9 00:36:31 10 11	accounting codes have been employed, correct?  A. They would be very helpful in understanding what constitutes these different codes.  Q. Is there any other evidence in the administrative record that you've reviewed that helps you understand what the error rates are?  A. Well, there's the inclusion at the beginning of the Eastern Region, there's a discussion as to what the error rates you know, that there were no error rates there was a no error rate conclusion with respect to this particular project with the Eastern Region.  Q. And let's turn on this exhibit to Bates page No. 2. Is
2 3 4 00:33:16 5 6 7 8 9 00:33:35 10 11 12 13	variance?  A. Well, this goes to the notion of the netting. At the end of this report, you'll see that the net variance is provided, and it does. It nets out the positives and negatives between these transactions.  Q. What I'd like you to turn your attention to now is Bates No. 9. And let's just focus on the top half of this first so it's more easily readable. You note that these reconciliations are done in accordance with accounting code 2?  A. Correct. There are I believe 42 that were accounting code 2 in this sample.  Q. But there's no variance?  A. I wouldn't expect there I don't know what the	2 3 4 00:36:09 5 6 7 8 9 00:36:31 10 11 12 13	accounting codes have been employed, correct?  A. They would be very helpful in understanding what constitutes these different codes.  Q. Is there any other evidence in the administrative record that you've reviewed that helps you understand what the error rates are?  A. Well, there's the inclusion at the beginning of the Eastern Region, there's a discussion as to what the error rates you know, that there were no error rates there was a no error rate conclusion with respect to this particular project with the Eastern Region.  Q. And let's turn on this exhibit to Bates page No. 2. Is this what you're referencing on the bottom of the page?
2 3 4 00:33:16 5 6 7 8 9 00:33:35 10 11 12 13 14	variance?  A. Well, this goes to the notion of the netting. At the end of this report, you'll see that the net variance is provided, and it does. It nets out the positives and negatives between these transactions.  Q. What I'd like you to turn your attention to now is Bates  No. 9. And let's just focus on the top half of this first so it's more easily readable. You note that these reconciliations are done in accordance with accounting code 2?  A. Correct. There are I believe 42 that were accounting code 2 in this sample.  Q. But there's no variance?  A. I wouldn't expect there I don't know what the alternative procedures are, but again, I know what they're not,	2 3 4 00:36:09 5 6 7 8 9 00:36:31 10 11 12 13 14	accounting codes have been employed, correct?  A. They would be very helpful in understanding what constitutes these different codes.  Q. Is there any other evidence in the administrative record that you've reviewed that helps you understand what the error rates are?  A. Well, there's the inclusion at the beginning of the Eastern Region, there's a discussion as to what the error rates you know, that there were no error rates there was a no error rate conclusion with respect to this particular project with the Eastern Region.  Q. And let's turn on this exhibit to Bates page No. 2. Is this what you're referencing on the bottom of the page?  A. Yeah. This conclusion, I think it rolls to the next page,
2 3 4 00:33:16 5 6 7 8 9 00:33:35 10 11 12 13 14 00:33:48 15	variance?  A. Well, this goes to the notion of the netting. At the end of this report, you'll see that the net variance is provided, and it does. It nets out the positives and negatives between these transactions.  Q. What I'd like you to turn your attention to now is Bates  No. 9. And let's just focus on the top half of this first so it's more easily readable. You note that these reconciliations are done in accordance with accounting code 2?  A. Correct. There are I believe 42 that were accounting code 2 in this sample.  Q. But there's no variance?  A. I wouldn't expect there I don't know what the alternative procedures are, but again, I know what they're not, so I wouldn't expect there to be a variance here under	2 3 4 00:36:09 5 6 7 8 9 00:36:31 10 11 12 13 14 00:36:52 15	accounting codes have been employed, correct?  A. They would be very helpful in understanding what constitutes these different codes.  Q. Is there any other evidence in the administrative record that you've reviewed that helps you understand what the error rates are?  A. Well, there's the inclusion at the beginning of the Eastern Region, there's a discussion as to what the error rates you know, that there were no error rates there was a no error rate conclusion with respect to this particular project with the Eastern Region.  Q. And let's turn on this exhibit to Bates page No. 2. Is this what you're referencing on the bottom of the page?  A. Yeah. This conclusion, I think it rolls to the next page, but this was the basis for what was then provided in some of the
2 3 4 00:33:16 5 6 7 8 9 00:33:35 10 11 12 13 14 00:33:48 15 16	variance?  A. Well, this goes to the notion of the netting. At the end of this report, you'll see that the net variance is provided, and it does. It nets out the positives and negatives between these transactions.  Q. What I'd like you to turn your attention to now is Bates No. 9. And let's just focus on the top half of this first so it's more easily readable. You note that these reconciliations are done in accordance with accounting code 2?  A. Correct. There are I believe 42 that were accounting code 2 in this sample.  Q. But there's no variance?  A. I wouldn't expect there I don't know what the alternative procedures are, but again, I know what they're not, so I wouldn't expect there to be a variance here under accounting code 2.	2 3 4 00:36:09 5 6 7 8 9 00:36:31 10 11 12 13 14 00:36:52 15 16	accounting codes have been employed, correct?  A. They would be very helpful in understanding what constitutes these different codes.  Q. Is there any other evidence in the administrative record that you've reviewed that helps you understand what the error rates are?  A. Well, there's the inclusion at the beginning of the Eastern Region, there's a discussion as to what the error rates you know, that there were no error rates there was a no error rate conclusion with respect to this particular project with the Eastern Region.  Q. And let's turn on this exhibit to Bates page No. 2. Is this what you're referencing on the bottom of the page?  A. Yeah. This conclusion, I think it rolls to the next page, but this was the basis for what was then provided in some of the summary information about the national sample, as it related to
2 3 4 00:33:16 5 6 7 8 9 00:33:35 10 11 12 13 14 00:33:48 15 16 17	variance?  A. Well, this goes to the notion of the netting. At the end of this report, you'll see that the net variance is provided, and it does. It nets out the positives and negatives between these transactions.  Q. What I'd like you to turn your attention to now is Bates No. 9. And let's just focus on the top half of this first so it's more easily readable. You note that these reconciliations are done in accordance with accounting code 2?  A. Correct. There are I believe 42 that were accounting code 2 in this sample.  Q. But there's no variance?  A. I wouldn't expect there I don't know what the alternative procedures are, but again, I know what they're not, so I wouldn't expect there to be a variance here under accounting code 2.  Q. And why wouldn't you expect a variance in accounting code	2 3 4 00:36:09 5 6 7 8 9 00:36:31 10 11 12 13 14 00:36:52 15 16 17	accounting codes have been employed, correct?  A. They would be very helpful in understanding what constitutes these different codes.  Q. Is there any other evidence in the administrative record that you've reviewed that helps you understand what the error rates are?  A. Well, there's the inclusion at the beginning of the Eastern Region, there's a discussion as to what the error rates you know, that there were no error rates there was a no error rate conclusion with respect to this particular project with the Eastern Region.  Q. And let's turn on this exhibit to Bates page No. 2. Is this what you're referencing on the bottom of the page?  A. Yeah. This conclusion, I think it rolls to the next page, but this was the basis for what was then provided in some of the summary information about the national sample, as it related to the Eastern Region.
2 3 4 00:33:16 5 6 7 8 9 00:33:35 10 11 12 13 14 00:33:48 15 16 17 18	variance?  A. Well, this goes to the notion of the netting. At the end of this report, you'll see that the net variance is provided, and it does. It nets out the positives and negatives between these transactions.  Q. What I'd like you to turn your attention to now is Bates  No. 9. And let's just focus on the top half of this first so it's more easily readable. You note that these reconciliations are done in accordance with accounting code 2?  A. Correct. There are I believe 42 that were accounting code 2 in this sample.  Q. But there's no variance?  A. I wouldn't expect there I don't know what the alternative procedures are, but again, I know what they're not, so I wouldn't expect there to be a variance here under accounting code 2.  Q. And why wouldn't you expect a variance in accounting code 2?	2 3 4 00:36:09 5 6 7 8 9 00:36:31 10 11 12 13 14 00:36:52 15 16 17 18	accounting codes have been employed, correct?  A. They would be very helpful in understanding what constitutes these different codes.  Q. Is there any other evidence in the administrative record that you've reviewed that helps you understand what the error rates are?  A. Well, there's the inclusion at the beginning of the Eastern Region, there's a discussion as to what the error rates you know, that there were no error rates there was a no error rate conclusion with respect to this particular project with the Eastern Region.  Q. And let's turn on this exhibit to Bates page No. 2. Is this what you're referencing on the bottom of the page?  A. Yeah. This conclusion, I think it rolls to the next page, but this was the basis for what was then provided in some of the summary information about the national sample, as it related to the Eastern Region.  So there were a total of 289 transactions. They said they
2 3 4 00:33:16 5 6 7 8 9 00:33:35 10 11 12 13 14 00:33:48 15 16 17 18 19	variance?  A. Well, this goes to the notion of the netting. At the end of this report, you'll see that the net variance is provided, and it does. It nets out the positives and negatives between these transactions.  Q. What I'd like you to turn your attention to now is Bates No. 9. And let's just focus on the top half of this first so it's more easily readable. You note that these reconciliations are done in accordance with accounting code 2?  A. Correct. There are I believe 42 that were accounting code 2 in this sample.  Q. But there's no variance?  A. I wouldn't expect there I don't know what the alternative procedures are, but again, I know what they're not, so I wouldn't expect there to be a variance here under accounting code 2.  Q. And why wouldn't you expect a variance in accounting code 2?  A. Well, it's not linked to a directly supporting document,	2 3 4 00:36:09 5 6 7 8 9 00:36:31 10 11 12 13 14 00:36:52 15 16 17 18 19	accounting codes have been employed, correct?  A. They would be very helpful in understanding what constitutes these different codes.  Q. Is there any other evidence in the administrative record that you've reviewed that helps you understand what the error rates are?  A. Well, there's the inclusion at the beginning of the Eastern Region, there's a discussion as to what the error rates you know, that there were no error rates there was a no error rate conclusion with respect to this particular project with the Eastern Region.  Q. And let's turn on this exhibit to Bates page No. 2. Is this what you're referencing on the bottom of the page?  A. Yeah. This conclusion, I think it rolls to the next page, but this was the basis for what was then provided in some of the summary information about the national sample, as it related to the Eastern Region.  So there were a total of 289 transactions. They said they directly reconciled 241 of those, or they were able to directly
2 3 4 00:33:16 5 6 7 8 9 00:33:35 10 11 12 13 14 00:33:48 15 16 17 18 19 00:34:00 20	variance?  A. Well, this goes to the notion of the netting. At the end of this report, you'll see that the net variance is provided, and it does. It nets out the positives and negatives between these transactions.  Q. What I'd like you to turn your attention to now is Bates  No. 9. And let's just focus on the top half of this first so it's more easily readable. You note that these reconciliations are done in accordance with accounting code 2?  A. Correct. There are I believe 42 that were accounting code  2 in this sample.  Q. But there's no variance?  A. I wouldn't expect there I don't know what the alternative procedures are, but again, I know what they're not, so I wouldn't expect there to be a variance here under accounting code 2.  Q. And why wouldn't you expect a variance in accounting code  2?  A. Well, it's not linked to a directly supporting document, it's not recomputed, whatever the recomputation means, and it's	2 3 4 00:36:09 5 6 7 8 9 00:36:31 10 11 12 13 14 00:36:52 15 16 17 18 19 00:37:09 20	accounting codes have been employed, correct?  A. They would be very helpful in understanding what constitutes these different codes.  Q. Is there any other evidence in the administrative record that you've reviewed that helps you understand what the error rates are?  A. Well, there's the inclusion at the beginning of the Eastern Region, there's a discussion as to what the error rates you know, that there were no error rates there was a no error rate conclusion with respect to this particular project with the Eastern Region.  Q. And let's turn on this exhibit to Bates page No. 2. Is this what you're referencing on the bottom of the page?  A. Yeah. This conclusion, I think it rolls to the next page, but this was the basis for what was then provided in some of the summary information about the national sample, as it related to the Eastern Region.  So there were a total of 289 transactions. They said they directly reconciled 241 of those, or they were able to directly reconcile it by using directly relevant documents. Again, what
2 3 4 00:33:16 5 6 7 8 9 00:33:35 10 11 12 13 14 00:33:48 15 16 17 18 19 00:34:00 20 21	variance?  A. Well, this goes to the notion of the netting. At the end of this report, you'll see that the net variance is provided, and it does. It nets out the positives and negatives between these transactions.  Q. What I'd like you to turn your attention to now is Bates  No. 9. And let's just focus on the top half of this first so it's more easily readable. You note that these reconciliations are done in accordance with accounting code 2?  A. Correct. There are I believe 42 that were accounting code 2 in this sample.  Q. But there's no variance?  A. I wouldn't expect there I don't know what the alternative procedures are, but again, I know what they're not, so I wouldn't expect there to be a variance here under accounting code 2.  Q. And why wouldn't you expect a variance in accounting code 2?  A. Well, it's not linked to a directly supporting document, it's not recomputed, whatever the recomputation means, and it's not a third-party source; it's some alternative procedure. So	2 3 4 00:36:09 5 6 7 8 9 00:36:31 10 11 12 13 14 00:36:52 15 16 17 18 19 00:37:09 20 21	accounting codes have been employed, correct?  A. They would be very helpful in understanding what constitutes these different codes.  Q. Is there any other evidence in the administrative record that you've reviewed that helps you understand what the error rates are?  A. Well, there's the inclusion at the beginning of the Eastern Region, there's a discussion as to what the error rates you know, that there were no error rates there was a no error rate conclusion with respect to this particular project with the Eastern Region.  Q. And let's turn on this exhibit to Bates page No. 2. Is this what you're referencing on the bottom of the page?  A. Yeah. This conclusion, I think it rolls to the next page, but this was the basis for what was then provided in some of the summary information about the national sample, as it related to the Eastern Region.  So there were a total of 289 transactions. They said they directly reconciled 241 of those, or they were able to directly reconcile it by using directly relevant documents. Again, what that means is, those were all accounting code 1, and it tells
2 3 4 00:33:16 5 6 7 8 9 00:33:35 10 11 12 13 14 00:33:48 15 16 17 18 19 00:34:00 20 21 22	variance?  A. Well, this goes to the notion of the netting. At the end of this report, you'll see that the net variance is provided, and it does. It nets out the positives and negatives between these transactions.  Q. What I'd like you to turn your attention to now is Bates  No. 9. And let's just focus on the top half of this first so it's more easily readable. You note that these reconciliations are done in accordance with accounting code 2?  A. Correct. There are I believe 42 that were accounting code 2 in this sample.  Q. But there's no variance?  A. I wouldn't expect there I don't know what the alternative procedures are, but again, I know what they're not, so I wouldn't expect there to be a variance here under accounting code 2.  Q. And why wouldn't you expect a variance in accounting code 2?  A. Well, it's not linked to a directly supporting document, it's not recomputed, whatever the recomputation means, and it's not a third-party source; it's some alternative procedure. So my guess is it's going to be highly unlikely under this	2 3 4 00:36:09 5 6 7 8 9 00:36:31 10 11 12 13 14 00:36:52 15 16 17 18 19 00:37:09 20 21 22	accounting codes have been employed, correct?  A. They would be very helpful in understanding what constitutes these different codes.  Q. Is there any other evidence in the administrative record that you've reviewed that helps you understand what the error rates are?  A. Well, there's the inclusion at the beginning of the Eastern Region, there's a discussion as to what the error rates you know, that there were no error rates there was a no error rate conclusion with respect to this particular project with the Eastern Region.  Q. And let's turn on this exhibit to Bates page No. 2. Is this what you're referencing on the bottom of the page?  A. Yeah. This conclusion, I think it rolls to the next page, but this was the basis for what was then provided in some of the summary information about the national sample, as it related to the Eastern Region.  So there were a total of 289 transactions. They said they directly reconciled 241 of those, or they were able to directly reconcile it by using directly relevant documents. Again, what that means is, those were all accounting code 1, and it tells you what the three different definitions of accounting code 1
2 3 4 00:33:16 5 6 7 8 9 00:33:35 10 11 12 13 14 00:33:48 15 16 17 18 19 00:34:00 20 21 22 23	variance?  A. Well, this goes to the notion of the netting. At the end of this report, you'll see that the net variance is provided, and it does. It nets out the positives and negatives between these transactions.  Q. What I'd like you to turn your attention to now is Bates  No. 9. And let's just focus on the top half of this first so it's more easily readable. You note that these reconciliations are done in accordance with accounting code 2?  A. Correct. There are I believe 42 that were accounting code  2 in this sample.  Q. But there's no variance?  A. I wouldn't expect there I don't know what the alternative procedures are, but again, I know what they're not, so I wouldn't expect there to be a variance here under accounting code 2.  Q. And why wouldn't you expect a variance in accounting code  2?  A. Well, it's not linked to a directly supporting document, it's not recomputed, whatever the recomputation means, and it's not a third-party source; it's some alternative procedure. So my guess is it's going to be highly unlikely under this alternative procedure, whatever those methods ultimately turn	2 3 4 00:36:09 5 6 7 8 9 00:36:31 10 11 12 13 14 00:36:52 15 16 17 18 19 00:37:09 20 21 22 23	accounting codes have been employed, correct?  A. They would be very helpful in understanding what constitutes these different codes.  Q. Is there any other evidence in the administrative record that you've reviewed that helps you understand what the error rates are?  A. Well, there's the inclusion at the beginning of the Eastern Region, there's a discussion as to what the error rates you know, that there were no error rates there was a no error rate conclusion with respect to this particular project with the Eastern Region.  Q. And let's turn on this exhibit to Bates page No. 2. Is this what you're referencing on the bottom of the page?  A. Yeah. This conclusion, I think it rolls to the next page, but this was the basis for what was then provided in some of the summary information about the national sample, as it related to the Eastern Region.  So there were a total of 289 transactions. They said they directly reconciled 241 of those, or they were able to directly reconcile it by using directly relevant documents. Again, what that means is, those were all accounting code 1, and it tells you what the three different definitions of accounting code 1 are here that I've articulated for the Court.
2 3 4 00:33:16 5 6 7 8 9 00:33:35 10 11 12 13 14 00:33:48 15 16 17 18 19 00:34:00 20 21 22 23 24	variance?  A. Well, this goes to the notion of the netting. At the end of this report, you'll see that the net variance is provided, and it does. It nets out the positives and negatives between these transactions.  Q. What I'd like you to turn your attention to now is Bates  No. 9. And let's just focus on the top half of this first so it's more easily readable. You note that these reconciliations are done in accordance with accounting code 2?  A. Correct. There are I believe 42 that were accounting code  2 in this sample.  Q. But there's no variance?  A. I wouldn't expect there I don't know what the alternative procedures are, but again, I know what they're not, so I wouldn't expect there to be a variance here under accounting code 2.  Q. And why wouldn't you expect a variance in accounting code  2?  A. Well, it's not linked to a directly supporting document, it's not recomputed, whatever the recomputation means, and it's not a third-party source; it's some alternative procedure. So my guess is it's going to be highly unlikely under this alternative procedure, whatever those methods ultimately turn out to be, it's going to be highly unlikely that you're going to	2 3 4 00:36:09 5 6 7 8 9 00:36:31 10 11 12 13 14 00:36:52 15 16 17 18 19 00:37:09 20 21 22 23 24	accounting codes have been employed, correct?  A. They would be very helpful in understanding what constitutes these different codes.  Q. Is there any other evidence in the administrative record that you've reviewed that helps you understand what the error rates are?  A. Well, there's the inclusion at the beginning of the Eastern Region, there's a discussion as to what the error rates you know, that there were no error rates there was a no error rate conclusion with respect to this particular project with the Eastern Region.  Q. And let's turn on this exhibit to Bates page No. 2. Is this what you're referencing on the bottom of the page?  A. Yeah. This conclusion, I think it rolls to the next page, but this was the basis for what was then provided in some of the summary information about the national sample, as it related to the Eastern Region.  So there were a total of 289 transactions. They said they directly reconciled 241 of those, or they were able to directly reconcile it by using directly relevant documents. Again, what that means is, those were all accounting code 1, and it tells you what the three different definitions of accounting code 1 are here that I've articulated for the Court.  Q. And then it goes on on the bottom of the page, carrying
2 3 4 00:33:16 5 6 7 8 9 00:33:35 10 11 12 13 14 00:33:48 15 16 17 18 19 00:34:00 20 21 22 23	variance?  A. Well, this goes to the notion of the netting. At the end of this report, you'll see that the net variance is provided, and it does. It nets out the positives and negatives between these transactions.  Q. What I'd like you to turn your attention to now is Bates  No. 9. And let's just focus on the top half of this first so it's more easily readable. You note that these reconciliations are done in accordance with accounting code 2?  A. Correct. There are I believe 42 that were accounting code 2 in this sample.  Q. But there's no variance?  A. I wouldn't expect there I don't know what the alternative procedures are, but again, I know what they're not, so I wouldn't expect there to be a variance here under accounting code 2.  Q. And why wouldn't you expect a variance in accounting code 2?  A. Well, it's not linked to a directly supporting document, it's not recomputed, whatever the recomputation means, and it's not a third-party source; it's some alternative procedure. So my guess is it's going to be highly unlikely under this alternative procedure, whatever those methods ultimately turn out to be, it's going to be highly unlikely that you're going to be able to contradict the dollar amount with the alternative	2 3 4 00:36:09 5 6 7 8 9 00:36:31 10 11 12 13 14 00:36:52 15 16 17 18 19 00:37:09 20 21 22 23	accounting codes have been employed, correct?  A. They would be very helpful in understanding what constitutes these different codes.  Q. Is there any other evidence in the administrative record that you've reviewed that helps you understand what the error rates are?  A. Well, there's the inclusion at the beginning of the Eastern Region, there's a discussion as to what the error rates you know, that there were no error rates there was a no error rate conclusion with respect to this particular project with the Eastern Region.  Q. And let's turn on this exhibit to Bates page No. 2. Is this what you're referencing on the bottom of the page?  A. Yeah. This conclusion, I think it rolls to the next page, but this was the basis for what was then provided in some of the summary information about the national sample, as it related to the Eastern Region.  So there were a total of 289 transactions. They said they directly reconciled 241 of those, or they were able to directly reconcile it by using directly relevant documents. Again, what that means is, those were all accounting code 1, and it tells you what the three different definitions of accounting code 1 are here that I've articulated for the Court.  Q. And then it goes on on the bottom of the page, carrying over to Bates 3, dealing with 42 transactions which were
2 3 4 00:33:16 5 6 7 8 9 00:33:35 10 11 12 13 14 00:33:48 15 16 17 18 19 00:34:00 20 21 22 23 24	variance?  A. Well, this goes to the notion of the netting. At the end of this report, you'll see that the net variance is provided, and it does. It nets out the positives and negatives between these transactions.  Q. What I'd like you to turn your attention to now is Bates  No. 9. And let's just focus on the top half of this first so it's more easily readable. You note that these reconciliations are done in accordance with accounting code 2?  A. Correct. There are I believe 42 that were accounting code  2 in this sample.  Q. But there's no variance?  A. I wouldn't expect there I don't know what the alternative procedures are, but again, I know what they're not, so I wouldn't expect there to be a variance here under accounting code 2.  Q. And why wouldn't you expect a variance in accounting code  2?  A. Well, it's not linked to a directly supporting document, it's not recomputed, whatever the recomputation means, and it's not a third-party source; it's some alternative procedure. So my guess is it's going to be highly unlikely under this alternative procedure, whatever those methods ultimately turn out to be, it's going to be highly unlikely that you're going to	2 3 4 00:36:09 5 6 7 8 9 00:36:31 10 11 12 13 14 00:36:52 15 16 17 18 19 00:37:09 20 21 22 23 24	accounting codes have been employed, correct?  A. They would be very helpful in understanding what constitutes these different codes.  Q. Is there any other evidence in the administrative record that you've reviewed that helps you understand what the error rates are?  A. Well, there's the inclusion at the beginning of the Eastern Region, there's a discussion as to what the error rates you know, that there were no error rates there was a no error rate conclusion with respect to this particular project with the Eastern Region.  Q. And let's turn on this exhibit to Bates page No. 2. Is this what you're referencing on the bottom of the page?  A. Yeah. This conclusion, I think it rolls to the next page, but this was the basis for what was then provided in some of the summary information about the national sample, as it related to the Eastern Region.  So there were a total of 289 transactions. They said they directly reconciled 241 of those, or they were able to directly reconcile it by using directly relevant documents. Again, what that means is, those were all accounting code 1, and it tells you what the three different definitions of accounting code 1 are here that I've articulated for the Court.  Q. And then it goes on on the bottom of the page, carrying

		I	
	1432		1434
1	reconciled, correct?	1	A. Again, there's nothing else in the administrative record
2	A. Correct.	2	that allows us to do this level of detail, to actually look
3	<b>Q.</b> Using alternative procedures, correct?	3	behind the curtain. This is the only part of that study that
4	A. Correct. It tells me nothing more than it was in fact an	4	allowed us to do so.
00:37:33 <b>5</b>	alternative procedure. And this again links to what we saw at	00:40:20 <b>5</b>	<b>Q.</b> And does it also discuss the approach that NORC has been
6	the bottom of that last table, which is the definition of the	6	taking with regard to how it is reconciling posted transactions,
7	accounting codes.	7	or not?
8	<b>Q.</b> And finally, at the end of this explanation by Deloitte &	8	A. Well, NORC's not doing any of the reconciliation work.
9	Touche it talks about six transactions which Deloitte was unable	9	That's all done by the accounting firms. NORC designs the
00:37:51 10	to reconcile, correct?	00:40:40 10	sample, provides the sample list, and then the accounting firms
11	A. That's correct.	11	go through the process of doing the reconciliation work.
12	<b>Q.</b> What does this tell you?	12	<b>Q.</b> What about the plan itself, the historical accounting plan?
13	A. Well, again, the error rate, if I were designing this as an	13	Let's go to Bates 33-2-14. Now, this itself, if you look at the
14	attribute sample and I was going to collect the information from	14	middle of the page, this deals with tribal reconciliation,
00:38:05 15	the variable sample anyway, then I would think that any error	00:41:10 15	correct?
16	should be counted as an error, because it's going to be	16	A. Correct.
17	extrapolated up to a large population in the electronic ledger	17	<b>Q.</b> And you're talking about error rates generally with regard
18	era. And that information indicates, based on the number of	18	to NORC's work, correct?
19	errors we saw there, it's going to be something in the $6-1/2$	19	A. Correct.
00:38:22 <b>20</b>	percent range, would be the errors in that particular instance.	00:41:19 <b>20</b>	Q. And tribal reconciliation work was used as a basis for
21	But by defining an error as having to reach a certain	21	taking the approach that was done in the 2007 Plan, correct?
22	level, you're able to reach DOI is able to reach a lower	22	A. At least in part, yes.
23	conclusion about the error rate, therefore draw a much smaller	23	<b>Q.</b> Now, you also discussed the fact earlier that the tribal
24	sample size.	24	reconciliation report had an error rate that was significantly
00:38:38 <b>25</b>	<b>Q.</b> And what is your understanding of what NORC actually stated	00:41:35 <b>25</b>	greater than 1 percent, didn't you?
	Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR		Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
	Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR Official Court Reporter		Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR Official Court Reporter
1	Official Court Reporter	1	Official Court Reporter
1 2	Official Court Reporter	1 2	Official Court Reporter
	Official Court Reporter  1433 with regard to the Eastern Region?		Official Court Reporter  1435  A. Well, the tribal reconciliation work had an unreconcilable
2	Official Court Reporter  1433 with regard to the Eastern Region?  A. My understanding is that they concluded that they	2	Official Court Reporter  1435  A. Well, the tribal reconciliation work had an unreconcilable rate in the area of about 13 percent, and this is being
3	Official Court Reporter  1433 with regard to the Eastern Region?  A. My understanding is that they concluded that they reconciled, of the 289, they're 98 plus percent certain that	3	Official Court Reporter  1435  A. Well, the tribal reconciliation work had an unreconcilable rate in the area of about 13 percent, and this is being pulled I believe this comes out of the 2007 Plan directly.
2 3 4	Official Court Reporter  1433 with regard to the Eastern Region?  A. My understanding is that they concluded that they reconciled, of the 289, they're 98 plus percent certain that there's a very low error rate based on the fact that they found	2 3 4	Official Court Reporter  1435  A. Well, the tribal reconciliation work had an unreconcilable rate in the area of about 13 percent, and this is being pulled I believe this comes out of the 2007 Plan directly.  And this goes to the notion of saying, well, doing the
2 3 4 00:38:59 <b>5</b>	Official Court Reporter  1433 with regard to the Eastern Region?  A. My understanding is that they concluded that they reconciled, of the 289, they're 98 plus percent certain that there's a very low error rate based on the fact that they found no errors.	2 3 4 00:41:55 <b>5</b>	Official Court Reporter  1435  A. Well, the tribal reconciliation work had an unreconcilable rate in the area of about 13 percent, and this is being pulled I believe this comes out of the 2007 Plan directly.  And this goes to the notion of saying, well, doing the historical accounting, we need to make an assumption. Before we
2 3 4 00:38:59 5 6	Official Court Reporter  1433 with regard to the Eastern Region?  A. My understanding is that they concluded that they reconciled, of the 289, they're 98 plus percent certain that there's a very low error rate based on the fact that they found no errors.  Q. Let's look at document 51-4 at 4. You've reviewed this	2 3 4 00:41:55 5 6	Official Court Reporter  1435  A. Well, the tribal reconciliation work had an unreconcilable rate in the area of about 13 percent, and this is being pulled I believe this comes out of the 2007 Plan directly.  And this goes to the notion of saying, well, doing the historical accounting, we need to make an assumption. Before we start, we need to make an assumption about what's the error rate
2 3 4 00:38:59 5 6 7	Official Court Reporter  1433 with regard to the Eastern Region?  A. My understanding is that they concluded that they reconciled, of the 289, they're 98 plus percent certain that there's a very low error rate based on the fact that they found no errors.  Q. Let's look at document 51-4 at 4. You've reviewed this document, haven't you, Mr. Duncan?	2 3 4 00:41:55 5 6 7	Official Court Reporter  1435  A. Well, the tribal reconciliation work had an unreconcilable rate in the area of about 13 percent, and this is being pulled I believe this comes out of the 2007 Plan directly.  And this goes to the notion of saying, well, doing the historical accounting, we need to make an assumption. Before we start, we need to make an assumption about what's the error rate going to be.
2 3 4 00:39:59 5 6 7 8	Official Court Reporter  1433 with regard to the Eastern Region?  A. My understanding is that they concluded that they reconciled, of the 289, they're 98 plus percent certain that there's a very low error rate based on the fact that they found no errors.  Q. Let's look at document 51-4 at 4. You've reviewed this document, haven't you, Mr. Duncan?  A. Yes, I have.	2 3 4 00:41:55 5 6 7 8	Official Court Reporter  1435  A. Well, the tribal reconciliation work had an unreconcilable rate in the area of about 13 percent, and this is being pulled I believe this comes out of the 2007 Plan directly.  And this goes to the notion of saying, well, doing the historical accounting, we need to make an assumption. Before we start, we need to make an assumption about what's the error rate going to be.  And when they looked at things, like they said here we
2 3 4 00:38:59 5 6 7 8 9 00:39:22 10 11	Official Court Reporter  1433 with regard to the Eastern Region?  A. My understanding is that they concluded that they reconciled, of the 289, they're 98 plus percent certain that there's a very low error rate based on the fact that they found no errors.  Q. Let's look at document 51-4 at 4. You've reviewed this document, haven't you, Mr. Duncan?  A. Yes, I have.  Q. And this is a statistical evaluation of preliminary Eastern	2 3 4 00:41:55 5 6 7 8 9	Official Court Reporter  1435  A. Well, the tribal reconciliation work had an unreconcilable rate in the area of about 13 percent, and this is being pulled I believe this comes out of the 2007 Plan directly.  And this goes to the notion of saying, well, doing the historical accounting, we need to make an assumption. Before we start, we need to make an assumption about what's the error rate going to be.  And when they looked at things, like they said here we looked at previous work like the tribal reconciliation project,
2 3 4 00:38:59 5 6 7 8 9	Official Court Reporter  1433 with regard to the Eastern Region?  A. My understanding is that they concluded that they reconciled, of the 289, they're 98 plus percent certain that there's a very low error rate based on the fact that they found no errors.  Q. Let's look at document 51-4 at 4. You've reviewed this document, haven't you, Mr. Duncan?  A. Yes, I have.  Q. And this is a statistical evaluation of preliminary Eastern Region sample results, March 2004, by NORC, correct?	2 3 4 00:41:55 5 6 7 8 9 00:42:09 10	Official Court Reporter  1435  A. Well, the tribal reconciliation work had an unreconcilable rate in the area of about 13 percent, and this is being pulled I believe this comes out of the 2007 Plan directly.  And this goes to the notion of saying, well, doing the historical accounting, we need to make an assumption. Before we start, we need to make an assumption about what's the error rate going to be.  And when they looked at things, like they said here we looked at previous work like the tribal reconciliation project, if you looked at that tribal reconciliation project and your
2 3 4 00:38:59 5 6 7 8 9 00:39:22 10 11	Official Court Reporter  1433 with regard to the Eastern Region?  A. My understanding is that they concluded that they reconciled, of the 289, they're 98 plus percent certain that there's a very low error rate based on the fact that they found no errors.  Q. Let's look at document 51-4 at 4. You've reviewed this document, haven't you, Mr. Duncan?  A. Yes, I have.  Q. And this is a statistical evaluation of preliminary Eastern Region sample results, March 2004, by NORC, correct?  A. Correct. This is a summary of the study that we just	2 3 4 00:41:55 5 6 7 8 9 00:42:09 10 11	Official Court Reporter  1435  A. Well, the tribal reconciliation work had an unreconcilable rate in the area of about 13 percent, and this is being pulled I believe this comes out of the 2007 Plan directly.  And this goes to the notion of saying, well, doing the historical accounting, we need to make an assumption. Before we start, we need to make an assumption about what's the error rate going to be.  And when they looked at things, like they said here we looked at previous work like the tribal reconciliation project, if you looked at that tribal reconciliation project and your thinking was if a transaction is unreconciled, I will treat it
2 3 4 00:38:59 5 6 7 8 9 00:39:22 10 11	Official Court Reporter  1433 with regard to the Eastern Region?  A. My understanding is that they concluded that they reconciled, of the 289, they're 98 plus percent certain that there's a very low error rate based on the fact that they found no errors.  Q. Let's look at document 51-4 at 4. You've reviewed this document, haven't you, Mr. Duncan?  A. Yes, I have.  Q. And this is a statistical evaluation of preliminary Eastern Region sample results, March 2004, by NORC, correct?  A. Correct. This is a summary of the study that we just looked at by Deloitte & Touche.	2 3 4 00:41:55 5 6 7 8 9 00:42:09 10 11	Official Court Reporter  1435  A. Well, the tribal reconciliation work had an unreconcilable rate in the area of about 13 percent, and this is being pulled I believe this comes out of the 2007 Plan directly.  And this goes to the notion of saying, well, doing the historical accounting, we need to make an assumption. Before we start, we need to make an assumption about what's the error rate going to be.  And when they looked at things, like they said here we looked at previous work like the tribal reconciliation project, if you looked at that tribal reconciliation project and your thinking was if a transaction is unreconciled, I will treat it as an error, then the assumption you would make about the
2 3 4 00:38:59 5 6 7 8 9 00:39:22 10 11 12 13	Official Court Reporter  1433 with regard to the Eastern Region?  A. My understanding is that they concluded that they reconciled, of the 289, they're 98 plus percent certain that there's a very low error rate based on the fact that they found no errors.  Q. Let's look at document 51-4 at 4. You've reviewed this document, haven't you, Mr. Duncan?  A. Yes, I have.  Q. And this is a statistical evaluation of preliminary Eastern Region sample results, March 2004, by NORC, correct?  A. Correct. This is a summary of the study that we just looked at by Deloitte & Touche.  Q. Let's go to Bates 4. Let's focus in on the highlighted	2 3 4 00:41:55 5 6 7 8 9 00:42:09 10 11 12 13	Official Court Reporter  1435  A. Well, the tribal reconciliation work had an unreconcilable rate in the area of about 13 percent, and this is being pulled I believe this comes out of the 2007 Plan directly.  And this goes to the notion of saying, well, doing the historical accounting, we need to make an assumption. Before we start, we need to make an assumption about what's the error rate going to be.  And when they looked at things, like they said here we looked at previous work like the tribal reconciliation project, if you looked at that tribal reconciliation project and your thinking was if a transaction is unreconciled, I will treat it as an error, then the assumption you would make about the underlying error rate is it would be something in the 13 percent
2 3 4 00:38:59 5 6 7 8 9 00:39:22 10 11 12 13 14	Official Court Reporter  1433 with regard to the Eastern Region?  A. My understanding is that they concluded that they reconciled, of the 289, they're 98 plus percent certain that there's a very low error rate based on the fact that they found no errors.  Q. Let's look at document 51-4 at 4. You've reviewed this document, haven't you, Mr. Duncan?  A. Yes, I have.  Q. And this is a statistical evaluation of preliminary Eastern Region sample results, March 2004, by NORC, correct?  A. Correct. This is a summary of the study that we just looked at by Deloitte & Touche.  Q. Let's go to Bates 4. Let's focus in on the highlighted portion of this page. What does this tell you, Mr. Duncan?	2 3 4 00:41:55 5 6 7 8 9 00:42:09 10 11 12 13 14	Official Court Reporter  1435  A. Well, the tribal reconciliation work had an unreconcilable rate in the area of about 13 percent, and this is being pulled I believe this comes out of the 2007 Plan directly.  And this goes to the notion of saying, well, doing the historical accounting, we need to make an assumption. Before we start, we need to make an assumption about what's the error rate going to be.  And when they looked at things, like they said here we looked at previous work like the tribal reconciliation project, if you looked at that tribal reconciliation project and your thinking was if a transaction is unreconciled, I will treat it as an error, then the assumption you would make about the underlying error rate is it would be something in the 13 percent area.
2 3 4 00:38:59 5 6 7 8 9 00:39:22 10 11 12 13 14 00:39:39 15	official Court Reporter  1433  with regard to the Eastern Region?  A. My understanding is that they concluded that they reconciled, of the 289, they're 98 plus percent certain that there's a very low error rate based on the fact that they found no errors.  Q. Let's look at document 51-4 at 4. You've reviewed this document, haven't you, Mr. Duncan?  A. Yes, I have.  Q. And this is a statistical evaluation of preliminary Eastern Region sample results, March 2004, by NORC, correct?  A. Correct. This is a summary of the study that we just looked at by Deloitte & Touche.  Q. Let's go to Bates 4. Let's focus in on the highlighted portion of this page. What does this tell you, Mr. Duncan?  A. Well, this is what we talked about this morning, is this	2 3 4 00:41:55 5 6 7 8 9 00:42:09 10 11 12 13 14 00:42:28 15	Official Court Reporter  1435  A. Well, the tribal reconciliation work had an unreconcilable rate in the area of about 13 percent, and this is being pulled I believe this comes out of the 2007 Plan directly.  And this goes to the notion of saying, well, doing the historical accounting, we need to make an assumption. Before we start, we need to make an assumption about what's the error rate going to be.  And when they looked at things, like they said here we looked at previous work like the tribal reconciliation project, if you looked at that tribal reconciliation project and your thinking was if a transaction is unreconciled, I will treat it as an error, then the assumption you would make about the underlying error rate is it would be something in the 13 percent area.  But in fact, that's not the assumption that they made. The
2 3 4 00:38:59 5 6 7 8 9 00:39:22 10 11 12 13 14 00:39:39 15 16	official Court Reporter  1433  with regard to the Eastern Region?  A. My understanding is that they concluded that they reconciled, of the 289, they're 98 plus percent certain that there's a very low error rate based on the fact that they found no errors.  Q. Let's look at document 51-4 at 4. You've reviewed this document, haven't you, Mr. Duncan?  A. Yes, I have.  Q. And this is a statistical evaluation of preliminary Eastern Region sample results, March 2004, by NORC, correct?  A. Correct. This is a summary of the study that we just looked at by Deloitte & Touche.  Q. Let's go to Bates 4. Let's focus in on the highlighted portion of this page. What does this tell you, Mr. Duncan?  A. Well, this is what we talked about this morning, is this notion that because of the way the error rate was defined, that	2 3 4 00:41:55 5 6 7 8 9 00:42:09 10 11 12 13 14 00:42:28 15 16	A. Well, the tribal reconciliation work had an unreconcilable rate in the area of about 13 percent, and this is being pulled I believe this comes out of the 2007 Plan directly.  And this goes to the notion of saying, well, doing the historical accounting, we need to make an assumption. Before we start, we need to make an assumption about what's the error rate going to be.  And when they looked at things, like they said here we looked at previous work like the tribal reconciliation project, if you looked at that tribal reconciliation project and your thinking was if a transaction is unreconciled, I will treat it as an error, then the assumption you would make about the underlying error rate is it would be something in the 13 percent area.  But in fact, that's not the assumption that they made. The assumption that is made, and it's all throughout the
2 3 4 00:38:59 5 6 7 8 9 00:39:22 10 11 12 13 14 00:39:39 15 16 17	official Court Reporter  1433  with regard to the Eastern Region?  A. My understanding is that they concluded that they reconciled, of the 289, they're 98 plus percent certain that there's a very low error rate based on the fact that they found no errors.  Q. Let's look at document 51-4 at 4. You've reviewed this document, haven't you, Mr. Duncan?  A. Yes, I have.  Q. And this is a statistical evaluation of preliminary Eastern Region sample results, March 2004, by NORC, correct?  A. Correct. This is a summary of the study that we just looked at by Deloitte & Touche.  Q. Let's go to Bates 4. Let's focus in on the highlighted portion of this page. What does this tell you, Mr. Duncan?  A. Well, this is what we talked about this morning, is this notion that because of the way the error rate was defined, that NORC can say that no errors were found. And on that basis they	2 3 4 00:41:55 5 6 7 8 9 00:42:09 10 11 12 13 14 00:42:28 15 16 17	A. Well, the tribal reconciliation work had an unreconcilable rate in the area of about 13 percent, and this is being pulled I believe this comes out of the 2007 Plan directly.  And this goes to the notion of saying, well, doing the historical accounting, we need to make an assumption. Before we start, we need to make an assumption about what's the error rate going to be.  And when they looked at things, like they said here we looked at previous work like the tribal reconciliation project, if you looked at that tribal reconciliation project and your thinking was if a transaction is unreconciled, I will treat it as an error, then the assumption you would make about the underlying error rate is it would be something in the 13 percent area.  But in fact, that's not the assumption that they made. The assumption that is made, and it's all throughout the administrative record, the assumption that was made was it would
2 3 4 00:38:59 5 6 7 8 9 00:39:22 10 11 12 13 14 00:39:39 15 16 17 18	official Court Reporter  1433  with regard to the Eastern Region?  A. My understanding is that they concluded that they reconciled, of the 289, they're 98 plus percent certain that there's a very low error rate based on the fact that they found no errors.  Q. Let's look at document 51-4 at 4. You've reviewed this document, haven't you, Mr. Duncan?  A. Yes, I have.  Q. And this is a statistical evaluation of preliminary Eastern Region sample results, March 2004, by NORC, correct?  A. Correct. This is a summary of the study that we just looked at by Deloitte & Touche.  Q. Let's go to Bates 4. Let's focus in on the highlighted portion of this page. What does this tell you, Mr. Duncan?  A. Well, this is what we talked about this morning, is this notion that because of the way the error rate was defined, that NORC can say that no errors were found. And on that basis they can make the kinds of statements that you see ahead of that, at	2 3 4 00:41:55 5 6 7 8 9 00:42:09 10 11 12 13 14 00:42:28 15 16 17 18	A. Well, the tribal reconciliation work had an unreconcilable rate in the area of about 13 percent, and this is being pulled I believe this comes out of the 2007 Plan directly.  And this goes to the notion of saying, well, doing the historical accounting, we need to make an assumption. Before we start, we need to make an assumption about what's the error rate going to be.  And when they looked at things, like they said here we looked at previous work like the tribal reconciliation project, if you looked at that tribal reconciliation project and your thinking was if a transaction is unreconciled, I will treat it as an error, then the assumption you would make about the underlying error rate is it would be something in the 13 percent area.  But in fact, that's not the assumption that they made. The assumption that is made, and it's all throughout the administrative record, the assumption that was made was it would be a very low error rate. And in order to make that assumption
2 3 4 00:38:59 5 6 7 8 9 00:39:22 10 11 12 13 14 00:39:39 15 16 17 18 19 00:39:55 20 21	official Court Reporter  1433  with regard to the Eastern Region?  A. My understanding is that they concluded that they reconciled, of the 289, they're 98 plus percent certain that there's a very low error rate based on the fact that they found no errors.  Q. Let's look at document 51-4 at 4. You've reviewed this document, haven't you, Mr. Duncan?  A. Yes, I have.  Q. And this is a statistical evaluation of preliminary Eastern Region sample results, March 2004, by NORC, correct?  A. Correct. This is a summary of the study that we just looked at by Deloitte & Touche.  Q. Let's go to Bates 4. Let's focus in on the highlighted portion of this page. What does this tell you, Mr. Duncan?  A. Well, this is what we talked about this morning, is this notion that because of the way the error rate was defined, that NORC can say that no errors were found. And on that basis they can make the kinds of statements that you see ahead of that, at the beginning of that sentence.	2 3 4 00:41:55 5 6 7 8 9 00:42:09 10 11 12 13 14 00:42:28 15 16 17 18 19	A. Well, the tribal reconciliation work had an unreconcilable rate in the area of about 13 percent, and this is being pulled I believe this comes out of the 2007 Plan directly.  And this goes to the notion of saying, well, doing the historical accounting, we need to make an assumption. Before we start, we need to make an assumption about what's the error rate going to be.  And when they looked at things, like they said here we looked at previous work like the tribal reconciliation project, if you looked at that tribal reconciliation project and your thinking was if a transaction is unreconciled, I will treat it as an error, then the assumption you would make about the underlying error rate is it would be something in the 13 percent area.  But in fact, that's not the assumption that they made. The assumption that is made, and it's all throughout the administrative record, the assumption that was made was it would be a very low error rate. And in order to make that assumption based on what they cited in the plan, you must have made the
2 3 4 00:38:59 5 6 7 8 9 00:39:22 10 11 12 13 14 00:39:39 15 16 17 18 19 00:39:55 20	official Court Reporter  1433  with regard to the Eastern Region?  A. My understanding is that they concluded that they reconciled, of the 289, they're 98 plus percent certain that there's a very low error rate based on the fact that they found no errors.  Q. Let's look at document 51-4 at 4. You've reviewed this document, haven't you, Mr. Duncan?  A. Yes, I have.  Q. And this is a statistical evaluation of preliminary Eastern Region sample results, March 2004, by NORC, correct?  A. Correct. This is a summary of the study that we just looked at by Deloitte & Touche.  Q. Let's go to Bates 4. Let's focus in on the highlighted portion of this page. What does this tell you, Mr. Duncan?  A. Well, this is what we talked about this morning, is this notion that because of the way the error rate was defined, that NORC can say that no errors were found. And on that basis they can make the kinds of statements that you see ahead of that, at the beginning of that sentence.  Q. And so no errors were found, basically, notwithstanding the	2 3 4 00:41:55 5 6 7 8 9 00:42:09 10 11 12 13 14 00:42:28 15 16 17 18 19 00:42:45 20	A. Well, the tribal reconciliation work had an unreconcilable rate in the area of about 13 percent, and this is being pulled I believe this comes out of the 2007 Plan directly.  And this goes to the notion of saying, well, doing the historical accounting, we need to make an assumption. Before we start, we need to make an assumption about what's the error rate going to be.  And when they looked at things, like they said here we looked at previous work like the tribal reconciliation project, if you looked at that tribal reconciliation project and your thinking was if a transaction is unreconciled, I will treat it as an error, then the assumption you would make about the underlying error rate is it would be something in the 13 percent area.  But in fact, that's not the assumption that they made. The assumption that is made, and it's all throughout the administrative record, the assumption that was made was it would be a very low error rate. And in order to make that assumption based on what they cited in the plan, you must have made the assumption that an unreconciled transaction is not an error. In
2 3 4 00:38:59 5 6 7 8 9 00:39:22 10 11 12 13 14 00:39:39 15 16 17 18 19 00:39:55 20 21	with regard to the Eastern Region?  A. My understanding is that they concluded that they reconciled, of the 289, they're 98 plus percent certain that there's a very low error rate based on the fact that they found no errors.  Q. Let's look at document 51-4 at 4. You've reviewed this document, haven't you, Mr. Duncan?  A. Yes, I have.  Q. And this is a statistical evaluation of preliminary Eastern Region sample results, March 2004, by NORC, correct?  A. Correct. This is a summary of the study that we just looked at by Deloitte & Touche.  Q. Let's go to Bates 4. Let's focus in on the highlighted portion of this page. What does this tell you, Mr. Duncan?  A. Well, this is what we talked about this morning, is this notion that because of the way the error rate was defined, that NORC can say that no errors were found. And on that basis they can make the kinds of statements that you see ahead of that, at the beginning of that sentence.  Q. And so no errors were found, basically, notwithstanding the issues that you've just discussed for the last several minutes,	2 3 4 00:41:55 5 6 7 8 9 00:42:09 10 11 12 13 14 00:42:28 15 16 17 18 19 00:42:45 20 21	A. Well, the tribal reconciliation work had an unreconcilable rate in the area of about 13 percent, and this is being pulled I believe this comes out of the 2007 Plan directly.  And this goes to the notion of saying, well, doing the historical accounting, we need to make an assumption. Before we start, we need to make an assumption about what's the error rate going to be.  And when they looked at things, like they said here we looked at previous work like the tribal reconciliation project, if you looked at that tribal reconciliation project and your thinking was if a transaction is unreconciled, I will treat it as an error, then the assumption you would make about the underlying error rate is it would be something in the 13 percent area.  But in fact, that's not the assumption that they made. The assumption that is made, and it's all throughout the administrative record, the assumption that was made was it would be a very low error rate. And in order to make that assumption based on what they cited in the plan, you must have made the assumption that an unreconciled transaction is not an error. In other words, if there's no supporting document, it's okay.
2 3 4 00:38:59 5 6 7 8 9 00:39:22 10 11 12 13 14 00:39:39 15 16 17 18 19 00:39:55 20 21 22	with regard to the Eastern Region?  A. My understanding is that they concluded that they reconciled, of the 289, they're 98 plus percent certain that there's a very low error rate based on the fact that they found no errors.  Q. Let's look at document 51-4 at 4. You've reviewed this document, haven't you, Mr. Duncan?  A. Yes, I have.  Q. And this is a statistical evaluation of preliminary Eastern Region sample results, March 2004, by NORC, correct?  A. Correct. This is a summary of the study that we just looked at by Deloitte & Touche.  Q. Let's go to Bates 4. Let's focus in on the highlighted portion of this page. What does this tell you, Mr. Duncan?  A. Well, this is what we talked about this morning, is this notion that because of the way the error rate was defined, that NORC can say that no errors were found. And on that basis they can make the kinds of statements that you see ahead of that, at the beginning of that sentence.  Q. And so no errors were found, basically, notwithstanding the issues that you've just discussed for the last several minutes, correct?	2 3 4 00:41:55 5 6 7 8 9 00:42:09 10 11 12 13 14 00:42:28 15 16 17 18 19 00:42:45 20 21 22	A. Well, the tribal reconciliation work had an unreconcilable rate in the area of about 13 percent, and this is being pulled I believe this comes out of the 2007 Plan directly.  And this goes to the notion of saying, well, doing the historical accounting, we need to make an assumption. Before we start, we need to make an assumption about what's the error rate going to be.  And when they looked at things, like they said here we looked at previous work like the tribal reconciliation project, if you looked at that tribal reconciliation project and your thinking was if a transaction is unreconciled, I will treat it as an error, then the assumption you would make about the underlying error rate is it would be something in the 13 percent area.  But in fact, that's not the assumption that they made. The assumption that is made, and it's all throughout the administrative record, the assumption that was made was it would be a very low error rate. And in order to make that assumption based on what they cited in the plan, you must have made the assumption that an unreconciled transaction is not an error. In other words, if there's no supporting document, it's okay.  That's the only way that you could cite that study as a premise

**Q.** Do you believe it's reasonable to assume a 1 percent error

Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
Official Court Reporter

00:40:07 **25** important?

Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR

Official Court Reporter

	1436		1438
1	rate based on the information in the tribal trust reconciliation	1	<b>Q.</b> Did he reference any documents that supported that opinion?
2	report?	2	A. No.
3	A. Base on the tribal reconciliation report, based on the	3	Q. If Dr. Lasater stated in his opinion to this Court that the
4	paragraph 19 work, based on the Rosenbaum work, based on	4	proposed difference testing to evaluate statistically whether
_		_	
	everything that I have observed, I don't think it's reasonable		the paper ledger and electronic era transactions were processed
6	to start if you're going to treat unreconciled as an error,	6	by the same quality of bookkeeping is sound, would you agree
7	it's not a reasonable basis to conclude that it's going to be a	7	with that opinion?
8	very low error rate. There's just too much missing information.	8	A. I definitely would not agree with that, on several levels.
9	<b>Q.</b> So how meaningful is the statement with regard to the	9	The notion the hypothesis that Dr. Lasater's putting forth
00:43:34 10	probability that transactions are accurate and balances are	00:46:23 10	and that is vaguely described in the plan is that whatever was
11	correct if in fact the assumption is unreasonable?	11	done over here in the electronic ledger era, what we're going to
12	A. Well, if it's premised on the notion that in order to	12	do is just go look in the paper ledger era, and if in fact
13	achieve an error it has to be not all the things that we talked	13	there's no material difference between what we see in the paper
14	about, it can't be accounting code 1, it can't be accounting	14	ledger era versus the work that was done in the electronic
00:43:54 15	code 2, in order for it to be an error it has to reach this	00:46:39 15	ledger era, then we'll assume that those two populations are the
16	notion of there being some contradictory underlying document, it	16	same.
17	really makes any of the implications to try and say something	17	Well, every bit of information I've reviewed in the
18	about the accuracy and completeness of the account transaction	18	administrative record indicates that that is not the case.
19	listing and the account balances, it really makes anything drawn	19	There's not even a reasonable basis to start with that
00:44:12 <b>20</b>		00:46:53 20	hypothesis.
21	from that meaningless.	21	<i>"</i>
	Q. You were also asked to rebut, Mr. Duncan, the expert		The only way that that hypothesis would potentially make
22	reports of Drs. Lasater, Scheuren and Hinkins; is that correct?	22	sense is if the criteria upon which you compare the electronic
23	A. That's correct.	23	ledger era to the paper ledger era is the same criteria, with
24	Q. Let's start with Dr. Lasater. Based on your recollection,	24	this very, very high hurdle to create an error. Something where
00:44:30 <b>25</b>	what were Dr. Lasater's opinions that he expressed to this	00:47:10 <b>25</b>	you would have almost no expectation of finding the error. You
	Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR		Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
	Official Court Reporter		Official Court Reporter
_	1437		1439
1	Court?	1	1439 might be able to reach the end conclusion that they're the same,
1 2		1 2	
_	Court?		might be able to reach the end conclusion that they're the same,
2	Court?  A. Dr. Lasater's opinions really focused on the expectation	2	might be able to reach the end conclusion that they're the same, but it's only because that which you are seeking to detect would
2 3	Court?  A. Dr. Lasater's opinions really focused on the expectation for how the paper ledger era would be executed.	3	might be able to reach the end conclusion that they're the same, but it's only because that which you are seeking to detect would not be detectable by the systems that you're using.
2 3 4	Court?  A. Dr. Lasater's opinions really focused on the expectation for how the paper ledger era would be executed.  Q. Just the paper ledger era?	2 3 4	might be able to reach the end conclusion that they're the same, but it's only because that which you are seeking to detect would not be detectable by the systems that you're using.  Q. Does the FTI September 30, 2007, report provide the support
2 3 4 00:44:48 5	Court?  A. Dr. Lasater's opinions really focused on the expectation for how the paper ledger era would be executed.  Q. Just the paper ledger era?  A. As it was expressed to the Court. In his written opinion	2 3 4 00:47:29 5	might be able to reach the end conclusion that they're the same, but it's only because that which you are seeking to detect would not be detectable by the systems that you're using.  Q. Does the FTI September 30, 2007, report provide the support for Dr. Lasater?
2 3 4 00:44:48 5 6	Court?  A. Dr. Lasater's opinions really focused on the expectation for how the paper ledger era would be executed.  Q. Just the paper ledger era?  A. As it was expressed to the Court. In his written opinion he had some statements that were very similar to what	2 3 4 00:47:29 5	might be able to reach the end conclusion that they're the same, but it's only because that which you are seeking to detect would not be detectable by the systems that you're using.  Q. Does the FTI September 30, 2007, report provide the support for Dr. Lasater?  A. No.
2 3 4 00:44:48 5 6 7	A. Dr. Lasater's opinions really focused on the expectation for how the paper ledger era would be executed.  Q. Just the paper ledger era?  A. As it was expressed to the Court. In his written opinion he had some statements that were very similar to what Dr. Scheuren had been saying. So as I read it, the Judge only	2 3 4 00:47:29 5 6 7	might be able to reach the end conclusion that they're the same, but it's only because that which you are seeking to detect would not be detectable by the systems that you're using.  Q. Does the FTI September 30, 2007, report provide the support for Dr. Lasater?  A. No.  Q. And why not?
2 3 4 00:44:48 5 6 7 8	A. Dr. Lasater's opinions really focused on the expectation for how the paper ledger era would be executed.  Q. Just the paper ledger era?  A. As it was expressed to the Court. In his written opinion he had some statements that were very similar to what Dr. Scheuren had been saying. So as I read it, the Judge only wanted to hear on the part that was not duplicative.	2 3 4 00:47:29 5 6 7 8	might be able to reach the end conclusion that they're the same, but it's only because that which you are seeking to detect would not be detectable by the systems that you're using.  Q. Does the FTI September 30, 2007, report provide the support for Dr. Lasater?  A. No.  Q. And why not?  A. There's just not enough information in that report to
2 3 4 00:44:48 5 6 7 8 9	A. Dr. Lasater's opinions really focused on the expectation for how the paper ledger era would be executed.  Q. Just the paper ledger era?  A. As it was expressed to the Court. In his written opinion he had some statements that were very similar to what  Dr. Scheuren had been saying. So as I read it, the Judge only wanted to hear on the part that was not duplicative.  Q. If Dr. Lasater stated that the proposed methodology for	2 3 4 00:47:29 5 6 7 8 9	might be able to reach the end conclusion that they're the same, but it's only because that which you are seeking to detect would not be detectable by the systems that you're using.  Q. Does the FTI September 30, 2007, report provide the support for Dr. Lasater?  A. No.  Q. And why not?  A. There's just not enough information in that report to determine that that's definitively the way that it's going to be
2 3 4 00:44:48 5 6 7 8 9 00:45:07 10	A. Dr. Lasater's opinions really focused on the expectation for how the paper ledger era would be executed.  Q. Just the paper ledger era?  A. As it was expressed to the Court. In his written opinion he had some statements that were very similar to what Dr. Scheuren had been saying. So as I read it, the Judge only wanted to hear on the part that was not duplicative.  Q. If Dr. Lasater stated that the proposed methodology for testing transactions in the paper ledger era is reasonable,	2 3 4 00:47:29 5 6 7 8 9 00:47:41 10	might be able to reach the end conclusion that they're the same, but it's only because that which you are seeking to detect would not be detectable by the systems that you're using.  Q. Does the FTI September 30, 2007, report provide the support for Dr. Lasater?  A. No.  Q. And why not?  A. There's just not enough information in that report to determine that that's definitively the way that it's going to be done.
2 3 4 00:44:48 5 6 7 8 9 00:45:07 10 11	A. Dr. Lasater's opinions really focused on the expectation for how the paper ledger era would be executed.  Q. Just the paper ledger era?  A. As it was expressed to the Court. In his written opinion he had some statements that were very similar to what Dr. Scheuren had been saying. So as I read it, the Judge only wanted to hear on the part that was not duplicative.  Q. If Dr. Lasater stated that the proposed methodology for testing transactions in the paper ledger era is reasonable, would you agree with that?	2 3 4 00:47:29 5 6 7 8 9 00:47:41 10 11	might be able to reach the end conclusion that they're the same, but it's only because that which you are seeking to detect would not be detectable by the systems that you're using.  Q. Does the FTI September 30, 2007, report provide the support for Dr. Lasater?  A. No.  Q. And why not?  A. There's just not enough information in that report to determine that that's definitively the way that it's going to be done.  Q. I'd like you to turn your attention to another exhibit from the administrative record. It is identified as 55-17-19. Have
2 3 4 00:44:48 5 6 7 8 9 00:45:07 10 11 12	A. Dr. Lasater's opinions really focused on the expectation for how the paper ledger era would be executed.  Q. Just the paper ledger era?  A. As it was expressed to the Court. In his written opinion he had some statements that were very similar to what  Dr. Scheuren had been saying. So as I read it, the Judge only wanted to hear on the part that was not duplicative.  Q. If Dr. Lasater stated that the proposed methodology for testing transactions in the paper ledger era is reasonable, would you agree with that?  A. Absolutely not.	2 3 4 00:47:29 5 6 7 8 9 00:47:41 10 11	might be able to reach the end conclusion that they're the same, but it's only because that which you are seeking to detect would not be detectable by the systems that you're using.  Q. Does the FTI September 30, 2007, report provide the support for Dr. Lasater?  A. No.  Q. And why not?  A. There's just not enough information in that report to determine that that's definitively the way that it's going to be done.  Q. I'd like you to turn your attention to another exhibit from the administrative record. It is identified as 55-17-19. Have you reviewed this report?
00:44:48 5 6 7 8 9 00:45:07 10 11 12 13 14	A. Dr. Lasater's opinions really focused on the expectation for how the paper ledger era would be executed.  Q. Just the paper ledger era?  A. As it was expressed to the Court. In his written opinion he had some statements that were very similar to what Dr. Scheuren had been saying. So as I read it, the Judge only wanted to hear on the part that was not duplicative.  Q. If Dr. Lasater stated that the proposed methodology for testing transactions in the paper ledger era is reasonable, would you agree with that?  A. Absolutely not.  Q. Why not?  A. Well, first of all, I don't know what basis Dr. Lasater has	2 3 4 00:47:29 5 6 7 8 9 00:47:41 10 11 12 13	might be able to reach the end conclusion that they're the same, but it's only because that which you are seeking to detect would not be detectable by the systems that you're using.  Q. Does the FTI September 30, 2007, report provide the support for Dr. Lasater?  A. No.  Q. And why not?  A. There's just not enough information in that report to determine that that's definitively the way that it's going to be done.  Q. I'd like you to turn your attention to another exhibit from the administrative record. It is identified as 55-17-19. Have you reviewed this report?  A. Yes, I have.
00:44:48 5 6 7 8 9 00:45:07 10 11 12 13	A. Dr. Lasater's opinions really focused on the expectation for how the paper ledger era would be executed.  Q. Just the paper ledger era?  A. As it was expressed to the Court. In his written opinion he had some statements that were very similar to what Dr. Scheuren had been saying. So as I read it, the Judge only wanted to hear on the part that was not duplicative.  Q. If Dr. Lasater stated that the proposed methodology for testing transactions in the paper ledger era is reasonable, would you agree with that?  A. Absolutely not.  Q. Why not?  A. Well, first of all, I don't know what basis Dr. Lasater has for reaching that conclusion. I've reviewed the administrative	2 3 4 00:47:29 5 6 7 8 9 00:47:41 10 11 12 13	might be able to reach the end conclusion that they're the same, but it's only because that which you are seeking to detect would not be detectable by the systems that you're using.  Q. Does the FTI September 30, 2007, report provide the support for Dr. Lasater?  A. No.  Q. And why not?  A. There's just not enough information in that report to determine that that's definitively the way that it's going to be done.  Q. I'd like you to turn your attention to another exhibit from the administrative record. It is identified as 55-17-19. Have you reviewed this report?  A. Yes, I have.  Q. I'd like you to turn to page 37 of this report. And I'd
00:44:48 5 6 7 8 9 00:45:07 10 11 12 13 14 00:45:21 15 16	A. Dr. Lasater's opinions really focused on the expectation for how the paper ledger era would be executed.  Q. Just the paper ledger era?  A. As it was expressed to the Court. In his written opinion he had some statements that were very similar to what  Dr. Scheuren had been saying. So as I read it, the Judge only wanted to hear on the part that was not duplicative.  Q. If Dr. Lasater stated that the proposed methodology for testing transactions in the paper ledger era is reasonable, would you agree with that?  A. Absolutely not.  Q. Why not?  A. Well, first of all, I don't know what basis Dr. Lasater has for reaching that conclusion. I've reviewed the administrative record, I've reviewed the NORC reports. There is precious	2 3 4 00:47:29 5 6 7 8 9 00:47:41 10 11 12 13 14 00:48:05 15 16	might be able to reach the end conclusion that they're the same, but it's only because that which you are seeking to detect would not be detectable by the systems that you're using.  Q. Does the FTI September 30, 2007, report provide the support for Dr. Lasater?  A. No.  Q. And why not?  A. There's just not enough information in that report to determine that that's definitively the way that it's going to be done.  Q. I'd like you to turn your attention to another exhibit from the administrative record. It is identified as 55-17-19. Have you reviewed this report?  A. Yes, I have.  Q. I'd like you to turn to page 37 of this report. And I'd like you to focus on the second bullet point, which is
00:44:48 5 6 7 8 9 00:45:07 10 11 12 13 14 00:45:21 15 16 17	A. Dr. Lasater's opinions really focused on the expectation for how the paper ledger era would be executed.  Q. Just the paper ledger era?  A. As it was expressed to the Court. In his written opinion he had some statements that were very similar to what Dr. Scheuren had been saying. So as I read it, the Judge only wanted to hear on the part that was not duplicative.  Q. If Dr. Lasater stated that the proposed methodology for testing transactions in the paper ledger era is reasonable, would you agree with that?  A. Absolutely not.  Q. Why not?  A. Well, first of all, I don't know what basis Dr. Lasater has for reaching that conclusion. I've reviewed the administrative record, I've reviewed the NORC reports. There is precious little information about what exactly is going to be done in the	2 3 4 00:47:29 5 6 7 8 9 00:47:41 10 11 12 13 14 00:48:05 15 16 17	might be able to reach the end conclusion that they're the same, but it's only because that which you are seeking to detect would not be detectable by the systems that you're using.  Q. Does the FTI September 30, 2007, report provide the support for Dr. Lasater?  A. No.  Q. And why not?  A. There's just not enough information in that report to determine that that's definitively the way that it's going to be done.  Q. I'd like you to turn your attention to another exhibit from the administrative record. It is identified as 55-17-19. Have you reviewed this report?  A. Yes, I have.  Q. I'd like you to turn to page 37 of this report. And I'd like you to focus on the second bullet point, which is highlighted on this page. It states: "A review of the
00:44:48 5 6 7 8 9 00:45:07 10 11 12 13 14 00:45:21 15 16 17 18	A. Dr. Lasater's opinions really focused on the expectation for how the paper ledger era would be executed.  Q. Just the paper ledger era?  A. As it was expressed to the Court. In his written opinion he had some statements that were very similar to what Dr. Scheuren had been saying. So as I read it, the Judge only wanted to hear on the part that was not duplicative.  Q. If Dr. Lasater stated that the proposed methodology for testing transactions in the paper ledger era is reasonable, would you agree with that?  A. Absolutely not.  Q. Why not?  A. Well, first of all, I don't know what basis Dr. Lasater has for reaching that conclusion. I've reviewed the administrative record, I've reviewed the NORC reports. There is precious little information about what exactly is going to be done in the paper ledger era. So I don't think there's an adequate basis to	2 3 4 00:47:29 5 6 7 8 9 00:47:41 10 11 12 13 14 00:48:05 15 16 17 18	might be able to reach the end conclusion that they're the same, but it's only because that which you are seeking to detect would not be detectable by the systems that you're using.  Q. Does the FTI September 30, 2007, report provide the support for Dr. Lasater?  A. No.  Q. And why not?  A. There's just not enough information in that report to determine that that's definitively the way that it's going to be done.  Q. I'd like you to turn your attention to another exhibit from the administrative record. It is identified as 55-17-19. Have you reviewed this report?  A. Yes, I have.  Q. I'd like you to turn to page 37 of this report. And I'd like you to focus on the second bullet point, which is highlighted on this page. It states: "A review of the paragraph 19 search indicates that records recovery diminished
00:44:48 5 6 7 8 9 00:45:07 10 11 12 13 14 00:45:21 15 16 17 18 19	A. Dr. Lasater's opinions really focused on the expectation for how the paper ledger era would be executed.  Q. Just the paper ledger era?  A. As it was expressed to the Court. In his written opinion he had some statements that were very similar to what Dr. Scheuren had been saying. So as I read it, the Judge only wanted to hear on the part that was not duplicative.  Q. If Dr. Lasater stated that the proposed methodology for testing transactions in the paper ledger era is reasonable, would you agree with that?  A. Absolutely not.  Q. Why not?  A. Well, first of all, I don't know what basis Dr. Lasater has for reaching that conclusion. I've reviewed the administrative record, I've reviewed the NORC reports. There is precious little information about what exactly is going to be done in the paper ledger era. So I don't think there's an adequate basis to reach the conclusion that it's reasonable. We don't know what	2 3 4 00:47:29 5 6 7 8 9 00:47:41 10 11 12 13 14 00:48:05 15 16 17 18 19	might be able to reach the end conclusion that they're the same, but it's only because that which you are seeking to detect would not be detectable by the systems that you're using.  Q. Does the FTI September 30, 2007, report provide the support for Dr. Lasater?  A. No.  Q. And why not?  A. There's just not enough information in that report to determine that that's definitively the way that it's going to be done.  Q. I'd like you to turn your attention to another exhibit from the administrative record. It is identified as 55-17-19. Have you reviewed this report?  A. Yes, I have.  Q. I'd like you to turn to page 37 of this report. And I'd like you to focus on the second bullet point, which is highlighted on this page. It states: "A review of the paragraph 19 search indicates that records recovery diminished from the 1930 to 1950 time frame and fell off before 1930."
00:44:48 5 6 7 8 9 00:45:07 10 11 12 13 14 00:45:21 15 16 17 18 19 00:45:34 20	A. Dr. Lasater's opinions really focused on the expectation for how the paper ledger era would be executed.  Q. Just the paper ledger era?  A. As it was expressed to the Court. In his written opinion he had some statements that were very similar to what  Dr. Scheuren had been saying. So as I read it, the Judge only wanted to hear on the part that was not duplicative.  Q. If Dr. Lasater stated that the proposed methodology for testing transactions in the paper ledger era is reasonable, would you agree with that?  A. Absolutely not.  Q. Why not?  A. Well, first of all, I don't know what basis Dr. Lasater has for reaching that conclusion. I've reviewed the administrative record, I've reviewed the NORC reports. There is precious little information about what exactly is going to be done in the paper ledger era. So I don't think there's an adequate basis to reach the conclusion that it's reasonable. We don't know what it is yet.	2 3 4 00:47:29 5 6 7 8 9 00:47:41 10 11 12 13 14 00:48:05 15 16 17 18 19 00:48:29 20	might be able to reach the end conclusion that they're the same, but it's only because that which you are seeking to detect would not be detectable by the systems that you're using.  Q. Does the FTI September 30, 2007, report provide the support for Dr. Lasater?  A. No.  Q. And why not?  A. There's just not enough information in that report to determine that that's definitively the way that it's going to be done.  Q. I'd like you to turn your attention to another exhibit from the administrative record. It is identified as 55-17-19. Have you reviewed this report?  A. Yes, I have.  Q. I'd like you to turn to page 37 of this report. And I'd like you to focus on the second bullet point, which is highlighted on this page. It states: "A review of the paragraph 19 search indicates that records recovery diminished from the 1930 to 1950 time frame and fell off before 1930."  What is your understanding of that statement?
00:44:48 5 6 7 8 9 00:45:07 10 11 12 13 14 00:45:21 15 16 17 18 19 00:45:34 20 21	A. Dr. Lasater's opinions really focused on the expectation for how the paper ledger era would be executed.  Q. Just the paper ledger era?  A. As it was expressed to the Court. In his written opinion he had some statements that were very similar to what Dr. Scheuren had been saying. So as I read it, the Judge only wanted to hear on the part that was not duplicative.  Q. If Dr. Lasater stated that the proposed methodology for testing transactions in the paper ledger era is reasonable, would you agree with that?  A. Absolutely not.  Q. Why not?  A. Well, first of all, I don't know what basis Dr. Lasater has for reaching that conclusion. I've reviewed the administrative record, I've reviewed the NORC reports. There is precious little information about what exactly is going to be done in the paper ledger era. So I don't think there's an adequate basis to reach the conclusion that it's reasonable. We don't know what it is yet.  Q. Did Dr. Lasater provide the basis for his opinion in that	2 3 4 00:47:29 5 6 7 8 9 00:47:41 10 11 12 13 14 00:48:05 15 16 17 18 19 00:48:29 20 21	might be able to reach the end conclusion that they're the same, but it's only because that which you are seeking to detect would not be detectable by the systems that you're using.  Q. Does the FTI September 30, 2007, report provide the support for Dr. Lasater?  A. No.  Q. And why not?  A. There's just not enough information in that report to determine that that's definitively the way that it's going to be done.  Q. I'd like you to turn your attention to another exhibit from the administrative record. It is identified as 55-17-19. Have you reviewed this report?  A. Yes, I have.  Q. I'd like you to turn to page 37 of this report. And I'd like you to focus on the second bullet point, which is highlighted on this page. It states: "A review of the paragraph 19 search indicates that records recovery diminished from the 1930 to 1950 time frame and fell off before 1930."  What is your understanding of that statement?  A. Well, this is just one piece of information. When I said I
00:44:48 5 6 7 8 9 00:45:07 10 11 12 13 14 00:45:21 15 16 17 18 19 00:45:34 20 21 22	A. Dr. Lasater's opinions really focused on the expectation for how the paper ledger era would be executed.  Q. Just the paper ledger era?  A. As it was expressed to the Court. In his written opinion he had some statements that were very similar to what Dr. Scheuren had been saying. So as I read it, the Judge only wanted to hear on the part that was not duplicative.  Q. If Dr. Lasater stated that the proposed methodology for testing transactions in the paper ledger era is reasonable, would you agree with that?  A. Absolutely not.  Q. Why not?  A. Well, first of all, I don't know what basis Dr. Lasater has for reaching that conclusion. I've reviewed the administrative record, I've reviewed the NORC reports. There is precious little information about what exactly is going to be done in the paper ledger era. So I don't think there's an adequate basis to reach the conclusion that it's reasonable. We don't know what it is yet.  Q. Did Dr. Lasater provide the basis for his opinion in that regard?	2 3 4 00:47:29 5 6 7 8 9 00:47:41 10 11 12 13 14 00:48:05 15 16 17 18 19 00:48:29 20 21 22	might be able to reach the end conclusion that they're the same, but it's only because that which you are seeking to detect would not be detectable by the systems that you're using.  Q. Does the FTI September 30, 2007, report provide the support for Dr. Lasater?  A. No.  Q. And why not?  A. There's just not enough information in that report to determine that that's definitively the way that it's going to be done.  Q. I'd like you to turn your attention to another exhibit from the administrative record. It is identified as 55-17-19. Have you reviewed this report?  A. Yes, I have.  Q. I'd like you to turn to page 37 of this report. And I'd like you to focus on the second bullet point, which is highlighted on this page. It states: "A review of the paragraph 19 search indicates that records recovery diminished from the 1930 to 1950 time frame and fell off before 1930."  What is your understanding of that statement?  A. Well, this is just one piece of information. When I said I reviewed the administrative record and it was clear to me that
00:44:48	A. Dr. Lasater's opinions really focused on the expectation for how the paper ledger era would be executed.  Q. Just the paper ledger era?  A. As it was expressed to the Court. In his written opinion he had some statements that were very similar to what  Dr. Scheuren had been saying. So as I read it, the Judge only wanted to hear on the part that was not duplicative.  Q. If Dr. Lasater stated that the proposed methodology for testing transactions in the paper ledger era is reasonable, would you agree with that?  A. Absolutely not.  Q. Why not?  A. Well, first of all, I don't know what basis Dr. Lasater has for reaching that conclusion. I've reviewed the administrative record, I've reviewed the NORC reports. There is precious little information about what exactly is going to be done in the paper ledger era. So I don't think there's an adequate basis to reach the conclusion that it's reasonable. We don't know what it is yet.  Q. Did Dr. Lasater provide the basis for his opinion in that regard?  A. Dr. Lasater indicated that he had had some discussions with	2 3 4 00:47:29 5 6 7 8 9 00:47:41 10 11 12 13 14 00:48:05 15 16 17 18 19 00:48:29 20 21 22 23	might be able to reach the end conclusion that they're the same, but it's only because that which you are seeking to detect would not be detectable by the systems that you're using.  Q. Does the FTI September 30, 2007, report provide the support for Dr. Lasater?  A. No.  Q. And why not?  A. There's just not enough information in that report to determine that that's definitively the way that it's going to be done.  Q. I'd like you to turn your attention to another exhibit from the administrative record. It is identified as 55-17-19. Have you reviewed this report?  A. Yes, I have.  Q. I'd like you to turn to page 37 of this report. And I'd like you to focus on the second bullet point, which is highlighted on this page. It states: "A review of the paragraph 19 search indicates that records recovery diminished from the 1930 to 1950 time frame and fell off before 1930."  What is your understanding of that statement?  A. Well, this is just one piece of information. When I said I reviewed the administrative record and it was clear to me that the expectation should be that the records in the paper ledger
00:44:48 5 6 7 8 9 00:45:07 10 11 12 13 14 00:45:21 15 16 17 18 19 00:45:34 20 21 22 23 24	A. Dr. Lasater's opinions really focused on the expectation for how the paper ledger era would be executed.  Q. Just the paper ledger era?  A. As it was expressed to the Court. In his written opinion he had some statements that were very similar to what  Dr. Scheuren had been saying. So as I read it, the Judge only wanted to hear on the part that was not duplicative.  Q. If Dr. Lasater stated that the proposed methodology for testing transactions in the paper ledger era is reasonable, would you agree with that?  A. Absolutely not.  Q. Why not?  A. Well, first of all, I don't know what basis Dr. Lasater has for reaching that conclusion. I've reviewed the administrative record, I've reviewed the NORC reports. There is precious little information about what exactly is going to be done in the paper ledger era. So I don't think there's an adequate basis to reach the conclusion that it's reasonable. We don't know what it is yet.  Q. Did Dr. Lasater provide the basis for his opinion in that regard?  A. Dr. Lasater indicated that he had had some discussions with NORC about how they were going to do that, but nothing really	2 3 4 00:47:29 5 6 7 8 9 00:47:41 10 11 12 13 14 00:48:05 15 16 17 18 19 00:48:29 20 21 22 23 24	might be able to reach the end conclusion that they're the same, but it's only because that which you are seeking to detect would not be detectable by the systems that you're using.  Q. Does the FTI September 30, 2007, report provide the support for Dr. Lasater?  A. No.  Q. And why not?  A. There's just not enough information in that report to determine that that's definitively the way that it's going to be done.  Q. I'd like you to turn your attention to another exhibit from the administrative record. It is identified as 55-17-19. Have you reviewed this report?  A. Yes, I have.  Q. I'd like you to turn to page 37 of this report. And I'd like you to focus on the second bullet point, which is highlighted on this page. It states: "A review of the paragraph 19 search indicates that records recovery diminished from the 1930 to 1950 time frame and fell off before 1930."  What is your understanding of that statement?  A. Well, this is just one piece of information. When I said I reviewed the administrative record and it was clear to me that the expectation should be that the records in the paper ledger era are significantly worse than the electronic ledger era, this
00:44:48	A. Dr. Lasater's opinions really focused on the expectation for how the paper ledger era would be executed.  Q. Just the paper ledger era?  A. As it was expressed to the Court. In his written opinion he had some statements that were very similar to what  Dr. Scheuren had been saying. So as I read it, the Judge only wanted to hear on the part that was not duplicative.  Q. If Dr. Lasater stated that the proposed methodology for testing transactions in the paper ledger era is reasonable, would you agree with that?  A. Absolutely not.  Q. Why not?  A. Well, first of all, I don't know what basis Dr. Lasater has for reaching that conclusion. I've reviewed the administrative record, I've reviewed the NORC reports. There is precious little information about what exactly is going to be done in the paper ledger era. So I don't think there's an adequate basis to reach the conclusion that it's reasonable. We don't know what it is yet.  Q. Did Dr. Lasater provide the basis for his opinion in that regard?  A. Dr. Lasater indicated that he had had some discussions with NORC about how they were going to do that, but nothing really materially beyond what we knew from the administrative record.	2 3 4 00:47:29 5 6 7 8 9 00:47:41 10 11 12 13 14 00:48:05 15 16 17 18 19 00:48:29 20 21 22 23	might be able to reach the end conclusion that they're the same, but it's only because that which you are seeking to detect would not be detectable by the systems that you're using.  Q. Does the FTI September 30, 2007, report provide the support for Dr. Lasater?  A. No.  Q. And why not?  A. There's just not enough information in that report to determine that that's definitively the way that it's going to be done.  Q. I'd like you to turn your attention to another exhibit from the administrative record. It is identified as 55-17-19. Have you reviewed this report?  A. Yes, I have.  Q. I'd like you to turn to page 37 of this report. And I'd like you to focus on the second bullet point, which is highlighted on this page. It states: "A review of the paragraph 19 search indicates that records recovery diminished from the 1930 to 1950 time frame and fell off before 1930."  What is your understanding of that statement?  A. Well, this is just one piece of information. When I said I reviewed the administrative record and it was clear to me that the expectation should be that the records in the paper ledger era are significantly worse than the electronic ledger era, this is simply something I believe this was presented by
00:44:48 5 6 7 8 9 00:45:07 10 11 12 13 14 00:45:21 15 16 17 18 19 00:45:34 20 21 22 23 24	A. Dr. Lasater's opinions really focused on the expectation for how the paper ledger era would be executed.  Q. Just the paper ledger era?  A. As it was expressed to the Court. In his written opinion he had some statements that were very similar to what  Dr. Scheuren had been saying. So as I read it, the Judge only wanted to hear on the part that was not duplicative.  Q. If Dr. Lasater stated that the proposed methodology for testing transactions in the paper ledger era is reasonable, would you agree with that?  A. Absolutely not.  Q. Why not?  A. Well, first of all, I don't know what basis Dr. Lasater has for reaching that conclusion. I've reviewed the administrative record, I've reviewed the NORC reports. There is precious little information about what exactly is going to be done in the paper ledger era. So I don't think there's an adequate basis to reach the conclusion that it's reasonable. We don't know what it is yet.  Q. Did Dr. Lasater provide the basis for his opinion in that regard?  A. Dr. Lasater indicated that he had had some discussions with NORC about how they were going to do that, but nothing really	2 3 4 00:47:29 5 6 7 8 9 00:47:41 10 11 12 13 14 00:48:05 15 16 17 18 19 00:48:29 20 21 22 23 24	might be able to reach the end conclusion that they're the same, but it's only because that which you are seeking to detect would not be detectable by the systems that you're using.  Q. Does the FTI September 30, 2007, report provide the support for Dr. Lasater?  A. No.  Q. And why not?  A. There's just not enough information in that report to determine that that's definitively the way that it's going to be done.  Q. I'd like you to turn your attention to another exhibit from the administrative record. It is identified as 55-17-19. Have you reviewed this report?  A. Yes, I have.  Q. I'd like you to turn to page 37 of this report. And I'd like you to focus on the second bullet point, which is highlighted on this page. It states: "A review of the paragraph 19 search indicates that records recovery diminished from the 1930 to 1950 time frame and fell off before 1930."  What is your understanding of that statement?  A. Well, this is just one piece of information. When I said I reviewed the administrative record and it was clear to me that the expectation should be that the records in the paper ledger era are significantly worse than the electronic ledger era, this

	1440		1442
	1 Mr. Edwards. This is simply documenting that fact, that the	1	Dr. Scheuren.
	2 records get worse the further you go back in time, which is not	2	Q. And did either Dr. Lasater or Dr. Scheuren take into
	3 a particularly controversial statement.	3	consideration in their opinion the fact that the target
	<b>4 Q.</b> So when Dr. Lasater made or offered his opinion, he didn't	4	population is different from the sample population due to
00:49:07	<b>5</b> address the concern of the diminishing availability of records,	00:51:45 <b>5</b>	missing and omitted data?
	<b>6</b> did he, as you go further back in time?	6	A. I don't believe that either one them specifically addressed
	7 A. He did not.	7	that. It was really addressed by Dr. Hinkins.
	<b>8 Q.</b> Did Dr. Scheuren?	8	Q. Do you know whether or not anyone has been tasked with
	9 A. I don't believe that he made any specific comments or	9	establishing the accuracy of account balances?
00:49:20	O opinions about how they were going to deal with this particular	00:51:58 10	A. I don't know if anyone I don't know of anyone that has
	1 issue.	11	been. I do know that NORC specifically stated they were not
	<b>2 Q.</b> So if the observations were made by Dr. Scheuren and	12	tasked with designing a sample that would address that issue.
	3 Dr. Lasater that the two eras, as they define paper and	13	Q. And that was in Dr. Hinkins' rebuttal report, wasn't it?
	4 electronic, are substantially similar, you see no basis to	14	A. That's correct.
00:49:38	<b>5</b> support those opinions, do you?	00:52:14 15	<b>Q.</b> What effect, if any, does that have on your view of the
'	6 A. I think the hypothesis itself is a waste of time to even	16	adequacy of the statistical sampling plan?
	7 bother to test. Everything would be contraindicated here. The	17	A. Well, I think fundamentally Dr. Hinkins and I agree on
	8 hypothesis should be that they're fundamentally different based	18	several topics. This is one of them. My criticism, my concern
	9 on everything that we've seen.	19	during my time in 2003, and at my preparation for the trial here
00:49:54	<b>Q.</b> And when you say everything, do you mean audit reports?	00:52:36 <b>20</b>	in 2007, has been that you can't take this kind of transaction
2	1 A. Audit reports, reconciliation reports, GAO reports, I mean	21	sampling and apply it to accounts. And the rebuttal point on
	2 reports to Congress, everything I've seen indicates that the	22	that issue from Dr. Hinkins was that NORC had never been asked
	3 records drop off substantially as you move back in time. And	23	to do a sample design that would address accounts.
2	4 again, it's because there's missing documents. There's records	24	So I think fundamentally we're in agreement on that point.
00:50:13	5 that have been destroyed.	00:52:54 <b>25</b>	What has been done in the LSA sampling will not address
	Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR		Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
	Official Court Reporter		Official Court Reporter
	1441		1443
	<b>Q.</b> Do you recall any discussion by Ms. Herman about how the	1	accounts, account balances.
	<ol> <li>Q. Do you recall any discussion by Ms. Herman about how the</li> <li>record and bookkeeping systems among the various regions and</li> </ol>	2	
	<ul> <li>Q. Do you recall any discussion by Ms. Herman about how the</li> <li>record and bookkeeping systems among the various regions and</li> <li>agencies were different over time?</li> </ul>	2 3	accounts, account balances.  Q. But if the LSA sampling was designed for purposes of limiting liability or error, it could be used as a sound basis,
	<ol> <li>Q. Do you recall any discussion by Ms. Herman about how the</li> <li>record and bookkeeping systems among the various regions and</li> <li>agencies were different over time?</li> <li>A. Yes. She testified that they varied over time and between</li> </ol>	2 3 4	accounts, account balances.  Q. But if the LSA sampling was designed for purposes of limiting liability or error, it could be used as a sound basis, could it not?
00:50:32	<ol> <li>Q. Do you recall any discussion by Ms. Herman about how the</li> <li>record and bookkeeping systems among the various regions and</li> <li>agencies were different over time?</li> <li>A. Yes. She testified that they varied over time and between</li> <li>agencies.</li> </ol>	2 3 4 00:53:09 5	accounts, account balances.  Q. But if the LSA sampling was designed for purposes of limiting liability or error, it could be used as a sound basis, could it not?  A. If it's limited to the electronic ledger era, and limited
00:50:32	<ol> <li>Q. Do you recall any discussion by Ms. Herman about how the</li> <li>record and bookkeeping systems among the various regions and</li> <li>agencies were different over time?</li> <li>A. Yes. She testified that they varied over time and between</li> <li>agencies.</li> <li>Q. So it would be very difficult in your opinion to reach the</li> </ol>	2 3 4 00:53:09 5 6	accounts, account balances.  Q. But if the LSA sampling was designed for purposes of limiting liability or error, it could be used as a sound basis, could it not?  A. If it's limited to the electronic ledger era, and limited to the documents that were available for sampling, then yes.
00:50:32	<ol> <li>Q. Do you recall any discussion by Ms. Herman about how the</li> <li>record and bookkeeping systems among the various regions and</li> <li>agencies were different over time?</li> <li>A. Yes. She testified that they varied over time and between</li> <li>agencies.</li> <li>Q. So it would be very difficult in your opinion to reach the</li> <li>conclusion that the paper records era and the electronic records</li> </ol>	2 3 4 00:53:09 5 6 7	accounts, account balances.  Q. But if the LSA sampling was designed for purposes of limiting liability or error, it could be used as a sound basis, could it not?  A. If it's limited to the electronic ledger era, and limited to the documents that were available for sampling, then yes.  Q. And similarly, couldn't NORC's LSA results for purposes of
00:50:32	<ol> <li>Q. Do you recall any discussion by Ms. Herman about how the</li> <li>record and bookkeeping systems among the various regions and</li> <li>agencies were different over time?</li> <li>A. Yes. She testified that they varied over time and between</li> <li>agencies.</li> <li>Q. So it would be very difficult in your opinion to reach the</li> <li>conclusion that the paper records era and the electronic records</li> <li>era are sufficiently similar to draw inferences from the</li> </ol>	2 3 4 00:53:09 5 6 7 8	accounts, account balances.  Q. But if the LSA sampling was designed for purposes of limiting liability or error, it could be used as a sound basis, could it not?  A. If it's limited to the electronic ledger era, and limited to the documents that were available for sampling, then yes.  Q. And similarly, couldn't NORC's LSA results for purposes of the litigation support accounting be considered as having an
	<ol> <li>Q. Do you recall any discussion by Ms. Herman about how the</li> <li>record and bookkeeping systems among the various regions and</li> <li>agencies were different over time?</li> <li>A. Yes. She testified that they varied over time and between</li> <li>agencies.</li> <li>Q. So it would be very difficult in your opinion to reach the</li> <li>conclusion that the paper records era and the electronic records</li> <li>era are sufficiently similar to draw inferences from the</li> <li>electronic era to the paper era, correct?</li> </ol>	2 3 4 00:53:09 5 6 7 8 9	accounts, account balances.  Q. But if the LSA sampling was designed for purposes of limiting liability or error, it could be used as a sound basis, could it not?  A. If it's limited to the electronic ledger era, and limited to the documents that were available for sampling, then yes.  Q. And similarly, couldn't NORC's LSA results for purposes of the litigation support accounting be considered as having an appropriate measure of error?
00:50:45	<ol> <li>Q. Do you recall any discussion by Ms. Herman about how the</li> <li>record and bookkeeping systems among the various regions and</li> <li>agencies were different over time?</li> <li>A. Yes. She testified that they varied over time and between</li> <li>agencies.</li> <li>Q. So it would be very difficult in your opinion to reach the</li> <li>conclusion that the paper records era and the electronic records</li> <li>era are sufficiently similar to draw inferences from the</li> <li>electronic era to the paper era, correct?</li> <li>A. I think that's a fair statement.</li> </ol>	2 3 4 00:53:09 5 6 7 8 9 00:53:28	accounts, account balances.  Q. But if the LSA sampling was designed for purposes of limiting liability or error, it could be used as a sound basis, could it not?  A. If it's limited to the electronic ledger era, and limited to the documents that were available for sampling, then yes.  Q. And similarly, couldn't NORC's LSA results for purposes of the litigation support accounting be considered as having an appropriate measure of error?  A. I'm sorry, I couldn't hear you over the coughing.
00:50:45	<ol> <li>Q. Do you recall any discussion by Ms. Herman about how the</li> <li>record and bookkeeping systems among the various regions and</li> <li>agencies were different over time?</li> <li>A. Yes. She testified that they varied over time and between</li> <li>agencies.</li> <li>Q. So it would be very difficult in your opinion to reach the</li> <li>conclusion that the paper records era and the electronic records</li> <li>era are sufficiently similar to draw inferences from the</li> <li>electronic era to the paper era, correct?</li> <li>A. I think that's a fair statement.</li> <li>Q. Now, Dr. Scheuren indicated that didn't Dr. Scheuren</li> </ol>	2 3 4 00:53:09 5 6 7 8 9 00:53:28 10 11	accounts, account balances.  Q. But if the LSA sampling was designed for purposes of limiting liability or error, it could be used as a sound basis, could it not?  A. If it's limited to the electronic ledger era, and limited to the documents that were available for sampling, then yes.  Q. And similarly, couldn't NORC's LSA results for purposes of the litigation support accounting be considered as having an appropriate measure of error?  A. I'm sorry, I couldn't hear you over the coughing.  Q. With regard to NORC's LSA results, the litigation support
00:50:45	<ol> <li>Q. Do you recall any discussion by Ms. Herman about how the record and bookkeeping systems among the various regions and agencies were different over time?</li> <li>A. Yes. She testified that they varied over time and between agencies.</li> <li>Q. So it would be very difficult in your opinion to reach the conclusion that the paper records era and the electronic records era are sufficiently similar to draw inferences from the electronic era to the paper era, correct?</li> <li>A. I think that's a fair statement.</li> <li>Q. Now, Dr. Scheuren indicated that didn't Dr. Scheuren indicate that no additional analysis or testing is necessary in</li> </ol>	2 3 4 00:53:09 5 6 7 8 9 00:53:28 10 11	accounts, account balances.  Q. But if the LSA sampling was designed for purposes of limiting liability or error, it could be used as a sound basis, could it not?  A. If it's limited to the electronic ledger era, and limited to the documents that were available for sampling, then yes.  Q. And similarly, couldn't NORC's LSA results for purposes of the litigation support accounting be considered as having an appropriate measure of error?  A. I'm sorry, I couldn't hear you over the coughing.  Q. With regard to NORC's LSA results, the litigation support accounting results, and its use of error in that regard, would
00:50:45	<ol> <li>Q. Do you recall any discussion by Ms. Herman about how the record and bookkeeping systems among the various regions and agencies were different over time?</li> <li>A. Yes. She testified that they varied over time and between agencies.</li> <li>Q. So it would be very difficult in your opinion to reach the conclusion that the paper records era and the electronic records era are sufficiently similar to draw inferences from the electronic era to the paper era, correct?</li> <li>A. I think that's a fair statement.</li> <li>Q. Now, Dr. Scheuren indicated that didn't Dr. Scheuren indicate that no additional analysis or testing is necessary in that regard?</li> </ol>	2 3 4 00:53:09 5 6 7 8 9 00:53:28 10 11 12 13	accounts, account balances.  Q. But if the LSA sampling was designed for purposes of limiting liability or error, it could be used as a sound basis, could it not?  A. If it's limited to the electronic ledger era, and limited to the documents that were available for sampling, then yes.  Q. And similarly, couldn't NORC's LSA results for purposes of the litigation support accounting be considered as having an appropriate measure of error?  A. I'm sorry, I couldn't hear you over the coughing.  Q. With regard to NORC's LSA results, the litigation support accounting results, and its use of error in that regard, would it be inappropriate use of error in the LSA that it is using
00:50:45	<ol> <li>Q. Do you recall any discussion by Ms. Herman about how the</li> <li>record and bookkeeping systems among the various regions and</li> <li>agencies were different over time?</li> <li>A. Yes. She testified that they varied over time and between</li> <li>agencies.</li> <li>Q. So it would be very difficult in your opinion to reach the</li> <li>conclusion that the paper records era and the electronic records</li> <li>era are sufficiently similar to draw inferences from the</li> <li>electronic era to the paper era, correct?</li> <li>A. I think that's a fair statement.</li> <li>Q. Now, Dr. Scheuren indicated that didn't Dr. Scheuren</li> <li>indicate that no additional analysis or testing is necessary in</li> <li>that regard?</li> <li>Dr. Scheuren indicated that there was no additional</li> </ol>	2 3 4 00:53:09 5 6 7 8 9 00:53:28 10 11 12 13 14	accounts, account balances.  Q. But if the LSA sampling was designed for purposes of limiting liability or error, it could be used as a sound basis, could it not?  A. If it's limited to the electronic ledger era, and limited to the documents that were available for sampling, then yes.  Q. And similarly, couldn't NORC's LSA results for purposes of the litigation support accounting be considered as having an appropriate measure of error?  A. I'm sorry, I couldn't hear you over the coughing.  Q. With regard to NORC's LSA results, the litigation support accounting results, and its use of error in that regard, would it be inappropriate use of error in the LSA that it is using versus what we're talking about, the establishment of accurate
00:50:45	<ol> <li>Q. Do you recall any discussion by Ms. Herman about how the record and bookkeeping systems among the various regions and agencies were different over time?</li> <li>A. Yes. She testified that they varied over time and between agencies.</li> <li>Q. So it would be very difficult in your opinion to reach the conclusion that the paper records era and the electronic records era are sufficiently similar to draw inferences from the electronic era to the paper era, correct?</li> <li>A. I think that's a fair statement.</li> <li>Q. Now, Dr. Scheuren indicated that didn't Dr. Scheuren indicate that no additional analysis or testing is necessary in that regard?</li> <li>A. Dr. Scheuren indicated that there was no additional analysis done in the electronic era.</li> </ol>	2 3 4 00:53:09 5 6 7 8 9 00:53:28 10 11 12 13 14 00:53:54 15	accounts, account balances.  Q. But if the LSA sampling was designed for purposes of limiting liability or error, it could be used as a sound basis, could it not?  A. If it's limited to the electronic ledger era, and limited to the documents that were available for sampling, then yes.  Q. And similarly, couldn't NORC's LSA results for purposes of the litigation support accounting be considered as having an appropriate measure of error?  A. I'm sorry, I couldn't hear you over the coughing.  Q. With regard to NORC's LSA results, the litigation support accounting results, and its use of error in that regard, would it be inappropriate use of error in the LSA that it is using versus what we're talking about, the establishment of accurate account balances?
00:50:45	<ol> <li>Q. Do you recall any discussion by Ms. Herman about how the record and bookkeeping systems among the various regions and agencies were different over time?</li> <li>A. Yes. She testified that they varied over time and between agencies.</li> <li>Q. So it would be very difficult in your opinion to reach the conclusion that the paper records era and the electronic records era are sufficiently similar to draw inferences from the electronic era to the paper era, correct?</li> <li>A. I think that's a fair statement.</li> <li>Q. Now, Dr. Scheuren indicated that didn't Dr. Scheuren indicate that no additional analysis or testing is necessary in that regard?</li> <li>A. Dr. Scheuren indicated that there was no additional analysis done in the electronic era.</li> <li>Q. Did he indicate whether or not additional analysis is</li> </ol>	2 3 4 00:53:09 5 6 7 8 9 00:53:28 10 11 12 13 14 00:53:54 15 16	accounts, account balances.  Q. But if the LSA sampling was designed for purposes of limiting liability or error, it could be used as a sound basis, could it not?  A. If it's limited to the electronic ledger era, and limited to the documents that were available for sampling, then yes.  Q. And similarly, couldn't NORC's LSA results for purposes of the litigation support accounting be considered as having an appropriate measure of error?  A. I'm sorry, I couldn't hear you over the coughing.  Q. With regard to NORC's LSA results, the litigation support accounting results, and its use of error in that regard, would it be inappropriate use of error in the LSA that it is using versus what we're talking about, the establishment of accurate account balances?  A. No. Again, I think the error rate is too narrowly defined
00:50:45	<ol> <li>Q. Do you recall any discussion by Ms. Herman about how the record and bookkeeping systems among the various regions and agencies were different over time?</li> <li>A. Yes. She testified that they varied over time and between agencies.</li> <li>Q. So it would be very difficult in your opinion to reach the conclusion that the paper records era and the electronic records era are sufficiently similar to draw inferences from the electronic era to the paper era, correct?</li> <li>A. I think that's a fair statement.</li> <li>Q. Now, Dr. Scheuren indicated that didn't Dr. Scheuren indicate that no additional analysis or testing is necessary in that regard?</li> <li>A. Dr. Scheuren indicated that there was no additional analysis done in the electronic era.</li> <li>Q. Did he indicate whether or not additional analysis is necessary?</li> </ol>	2 3 4 00:53:09 5 6 7 8 9 00:53:28 10 11 12 13 14 00:53:54 15 16 17	accounts, account balances.  Q. But if the LSA sampling was designed for purposes of limiting liability or error, it could be used as a sound basis, could it not?  A. If it's limited to the electronic ledger era, and limited to the documents that were available for sampling, then yes.  Q. And similarly, couldn't NORC's LSA results for purposes of the litigation support accounting be considered as having an appropriate measure of error?  A. I'm sorry, I couldn't hear you over the coughing.  Q. With regard to NORC's LSA results, the litigation support accounting results, and its use of error in that regard, would it be inappropriate use of error in the LSA that it is using versus what we're talking about, the establishment of accurate account balances?  A. No. Again, I think the error rate is too narrowly defined to be useful even in that context.
00:50:45	Q. Do you recall any discussion by Ms. Herman about how the record and bookkeeping systems among the various regions and agencies were different over time?  A. Yes. She testified that they varied over time and between agencies.  Q. So it would be very difficult in your opinion to reach the conclusion that the paper records era and the electronic records era are sufficiently similar to draw inferences from the electronic era to the paper era, correct?  A. I think that's a fair statement.  Q. Now, Dr. Scheuren indicated that didn't Dr. Scheuren indicate that no additional analysis or testing is necessary in that regard?  A. Dr. Scheuren indicated that there was no additional analysis done in the electronic era.  Q. Did he indicate whether or not additional analysis is necessary?  A. In the electronic era?	2 3 4 00:53:09 5 6 7 8 9 00:53:28 10 11 12 13 14 00:53:54 15 16	accounts, account balances.  Q. But if the LSA sampling was designed for purposes of limiting liability or error, it could be used as a sound basis, could it not?  A. If it's limited to the electronic ledger era, and limited to the documents that were available for sampling, then yes.  Q. And similarly, couldn't NORC's LSA results for purposes of the litigation support accounting be considered as having an appropriate measure of error?  A. I'm sorry, I couldn't hear you over the coughing.  Q. With regard to NORC's LSA results, the litigation support accounting results, and its use of error in that regard, would it be inappropriate use of error in the LSA that it is using versus what we're talking about, the establishment of accurate account balances?  A. No. Again, I think the error rate is too narrowly defined to be useful even in that context.  Q. And does a qualitative meta-analysis report assist
00:50:45	Q. Do you recall any discussion by Ms. Herman about how the record and bookkeeping systems among the various regions and agencies were different over time?  A. Yes. She testified that they varied over time and between agencies.  Q. So it would be very difficult in your opinion to reach the conclusion that the paper records era and the electronic records era are sufficiently similar to draw inferences from the electronic era to the paper era, correct?  A. I think that's a fair statement.  Q. Now, Dr. Scheuren indicated that didn't Dr. Scheuren indicate that no additional analysis or testing is necessary in that regard?  A. Dr. Scheuren indicated that there was no additional analysis done in the electronic era.  Q. Did he indicate whether or not additional analysis is necessary?  A. In the electronic era?  Q. Correct.	2 3 4 00:53:09 5 6 7 8 9 00:53:28 10 11 12 13 14 00:53:54 15 16 17 18 19	accounts, account balances.  Q. But if the LSA sampling was designed for purposes of limiting liability or error, it could be used as a sound basis, could it not?  A. If it's limited to the electronic ledger era, and limited to the documents that were available for sampling, then yes.  Q. And similarly, couldn't NORC's LSA results for purposes of the litigation support accounting be considered as having an appropriate measure of error?  A. I'm sorry, I couldn't hear you over the coughing.  Q. With regard to NORC's LSA results, the litigation support accounting results, and its use of error in that regard, would it be inappropriate use of error in the LSA that it is using versus what we're talking about, the establishment of accurate account balances?  A. No. Again, I think the error rate is too narrowly defined to be useful even in that context.  Q. And does a qualitative meta-analysis report assist  Dr. Scheuren in his opinions with regard to the appropriateness
00:50:45 ° ° ° ° ° ° ° ° ° ° ° ° ° ° ° ° ° ° °	Q. Do you recall any discussion by Ms. Herman about how the record and bookkeeping systems among the various regions and agencies were different over time?  A. Yes. She testified that they varied over time and between agencies.  Q. So it would be very difficult in your opinion to reach the conclusion that the paper records era and the electronic records era are sufficiently similar to draw inferences from the electronic era to the paper era, correct?  A. I think that's a fair statement.  Q. Now, Dr. Scheuren indicated that didn't Dr. Scheuren indicate that no additional analysis or testing is necessary in that regard?  A. Dr. Scheuren indicated that there was no additional analysis done in the electronic era.  Q. Did he indicate whether or not additional analysis is necessary?  A. In the electronic era?  Q. Correct.  A. He indicated that it was not.	2 3 4 00:53:09 5 6 7 8 9 00:53:28 10 11 12 13 14 00:53:54 15 16 17 18	accounts, account balances.  Q. But if the LSA sampling was designed for purposes of limiting liability or error, it could be used as a sound basis, could it not?  A. If it's limited to the electronic ledger era, and limited to the documents that were available for sampling, then yes.  Q. And similarly, couldn't NORC's LSA results for purposes of the litigation support accounting be considered as having an appropriate measure of error?  A. I'm sorry, I couldn't hear you over the coughing.  Q. With regard to NORC's LSA results, the litigation support accounting results, and its use of error in that regard, would it be inappropriate use of error in the LSA that it is using versus what we're talking about, the establishment of accurate account balances?  A. No. Again, I think the error rate is too narrowly defined to be useful even in that context.  Q. And does a qualitative meta-analysis report assist
00:50:45 ° ° ° ° ° ° ° ° ° ° ° ° ° ° ° ° ° ° °	Q. Do you recall any discussion by Ms. Herman about how the record and bookkeeping systems among the various regions and agencies were different over time?  A. Yes. She testified that they varied over time and between agencies.  Q. So it would be very difficult in your opinion to reach the conclusion that the paper records era and the electronic records era are sufficiently similar to draw inferences from the electronic era to the paper era, correct?  A. I think that's a fair statement.  Q. Now, Dr. Scheuren indicated that didn't Dr. Scheuren indicate that no additional analysis or testing is necessary in that regard?  A. Dr. Scheuren indicated that there was no additional analysis done in the electronic era.  Q. Did he indicate whether or not additional analysis is necessary?  A. In the electronic era?  Q. Correct.  A. He indicated that it was not.	2 3 4 00:53:09 5 6 7 8 9 00:53:28 10 11 12 13 14 00:53:54 15 16 17 18 19 00:54:10 20	accounts, account balances.  Q. But if the LSA sampling was designed for purposes of limiting liability or error, it could be used as a sound basis, could it not?  A. If it's limited to the electronic ledger era, and limited to the documents that were available for sampling, then yes.  Q. And similarly, couldn't NORC's LSA results for purposes of the litigation support accounting be considered as having an appropriate measure of error?  A. I'm sorry, I couldn't hear you over the coughing.  Q. With regard to NORC's LSA results, the litigation support accounting results, and its use of error in that regard, would it be inappropriate use of error in the LSA that it is using versus what we're talking about, the establishment of accurate account balances?  A. No. Again, I think the error rate is too narrowly defined to be useful even in that context.  Q. And does a qualitative meta-analysis report assist  Dr. Scheuren in his opinions with regard to the appropriateness of drawing inferences from the electronic record era to the
00:50:45 , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	Q. Do you recall any discussion by Ms. Herman about how the record and bookkeeping systems among the various regions and agencies were different over time?  A. Yes. She testified that they varied over time and between agencies.  Q. So it would be very difficult in your opinion to reach the conclusion that the paper records era and the electronic records era are sufficiently similar to draw inferences from the electronic era to the paper era, correct?  A. I think that's a fair statement.  Q. Now, Dr. Scheuren indicated that didn't Dr. Scheuren indicate that no additional analysis or testing is necessary in that regard?  A. Dr. Scheuren indicated that there was no additional analysis done in the electronic era.  Q. Did he indicate whether or not additional analysis is necessary?  A. In the electronic era?  Q. Correct.  A. He indicated that it was not.  Q. Now, did Dr. Scheuren take into consideration that the LSA	2 3 4 00:53:09 5 6 7 8 9 00:53:28 10 11 12 13 14 00:53:54 15 16 17 18 19 00:54:10 20 21	accounts, account balances.  Q. But if the LSA sampling was designed for purposes of limiting liability or error, it could be used as a sound basis, could it not?  A. If it's limited to the electronic ledger era, and limited to the documents that were available for sampling, then yes.  Q. And similarly, couldn't NORC's LSA results for purposes of the litigation support accounting be considered as having an appropriate measure of error?  A. I'm sorry, I couldn't hear you over the coughing.  Q. With regard to NORC's LSA results, the litigation support accounting results, and its use of error in that regard, would it be inappropriate use of error in the LSA that it is using versus what we're talking about, the establishment of accurate account balances?  A. No. Again, I think the error rate is too narrowly defined to be useful even in that context.  Q. And does a qualitative meta-analysis report assist  Dr. Scheuren in his opinions with regard to the appropriateness of drawing inferences from the electronic record era to the paper record era?
00.50:45 '	Q. Do you recall any discussion by Ms. Herman about how the record and bookkeeping systems among the various regions and agencies were different over time?  A. Yes. She testified that they varied over time and between agencies.  Q. So it would be very difficult in your opinion to reach the conclusion that the paper records era and the electronic records era are sufficiently similar to draw inferences from the electronic era to the paper era, correct?  A. I think that's a fair statement.  Q. Now, Dr. Scheuren indicated that didn't Dr. Scheuren indicate that no additional analysis or testing is necessary in that regard?  A. Dr. Scheuren indicated that there was no additional analysis done in the electronic era.  Q. Did he indicate whether or not additional analysis is necessary?  A. In the electronic era?  Q. Correct.  A. He indicated that it was not.  Q. Now, did Dr. Scheuren take into consideration that the LSA project was designed to estimate risk exposure, not transaction	2 3 4 00:53:09 5 6 7 8 9 00:53:28 10 11 12 13 14 00:53:54 15 16 17 18 19 00:54:10 20 21 22	accounts, account balances.  Q. But if the LSA sampling was designed for purposes of limiting liability or error, it could be used as a sound basis, could it not?  A. If it's limited to the electronic ledger era, and limited to the documents that were available for sampling, then yes.  Q. And similarly, couldn't NORC's LSA results for purposes of the litigation support accounting be considered as having an appropriate measure of error?  A. I'm sorry, I couldn't hear you over the coughing.  Q. With regard to NORC's LSA results, the litigation support accounting results, and its use of error in that regard, would it be inappropriate use of error in the LSA that it is using versus what we're talking about, the establishment of accurate account balances?  A. No. Again, I think the error rate is too narrowly defined to be useful even in that context.  Q. And does a qualitative meta-analysis report assist  Dr. Scheuren in his opinions with regard to the appropriateness of drawing inferences from the electronic record era to the paper record era?  A. I don't believe it provides any reasonable basis for making
00.50:45 '	Q. Do you recall any discussion by Ms. Herman about how the record and bookkeeping systems among the various regions and agencies were different over time?  A. Yes. She testified that they varied over time and between agencies.  Q. So it would be very difficult in your opinion to reach the conclusion that the paper records era and the electronic records era are sufficiently similar to draw inferences from the electronic era to the paper era, correct?  A. I think that's a fair statement.  Q. Now, Dr. Scheuren indicated that didn't Dr. Scheuren indicate that no additional analysis or testing is necessary in that regard?  A. Dr. Scheuren indicated that there was no additional analysis done in the electronic era.  Q. Did he indicate whether or not additional analysis is necessary?  A. In the electronic era?  Q. Correct.  A. He indicated that it was not.  Q. Now, did Dr. Scheuren take into consideration that the LSA project was designed to estimate risk exposure, not transaction accuracy?  A. No. Again, the notion of the application of the faulty	2 3 4 00:53:09 5 6 7 8 9 00:53:28 10 11 12 13 14 00:53:54 15 16 17 18 19 00:54:10 20 21 22 23	accounts, account balances.  Q. But if the LSA sampling was designed for purposes of limiting liability or error, it could be used as a sound basis, could it not?  A. If it's limited to the electronic ledger era, and limited to the documents that were available for sampling, then yes.  Q. And similarly, couldn't NORC's LSA results for purposes of the litigation support accounting be considered as having an appropriate measure of error?  A. I'm sorry, I couldn't hear you over the coughing.  Q. With regard to NORC's LSA results, the litigation support accounting results, and its use of error in that regard, would it be inappropriate use of error in the LSA that it is using versus what we're talking about, the establishment of accurate account balances?  A. No. Again, I think the error rate is too narrowly defined to be useful even in that context.  Q. And does a qualitative meta-analysis report assist  Dr. Scheuren in his opinions with regard to the appropriateness of drawing inferences from the electronic record era to the paper record era?  A. I don't believe it provides any reasonable basis for making that conclusion.
00:50:45 / , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	Q. Do you recall any discussion by Ms. Herman about how the record and bookkeeping systems among the various regions and agencies were different over time?  A. Yes. She testified that they varied over time and between agencies.  Q. So it would be very difficult in your opinion to reach the conclusion that the paper records era and the electronic records era are sufficiently similar to draw inferences from the electronic era to the paper era, correct?  A. I think that's a fair statement.  Q. Now, Dr. Scheuren indicated that didn't Dr. Scheuren indicate that no additional analysis or testing is necessary in that regard?  A. Dr. Scheuren indicated that there was no additional analysis done in the electronic era.  Q. Did he indicate whether or not additional analysis is necessary?  A. In the electronic era?  Q. Correct.  A. He indicated that it was not.  Q. Now, did Dr. Scheuren take into consideration that the LSA project was designed to estimate risk exposure, not transaction accuracy?  A. No. Again, the notion of the application of the faulty	2 3 4 00:53:09 5 6 7 8 9 00:53:28 10 11 12 13 14 00:53:54 15 16 17 18 19 00:54:10 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Q. But if the LSA sampling was designed for purposes of limiting liability or error, it could be used as a sound basis, could it not?</li> <li>A. If it's limited to the electronic ledger era, and limited to the documents that were available for sampling, then yes.</li> <li>Q. And similarly, couldn't NORC's LSA results for purposes of the litigation support accounting be considered as having an appropriate measure of error?</li> <li>A. I'm sorry, I couldn't hear you over the coughing.</li> <li>Q. With regard to NORC's LSA results, the litigation support accounting results, and its use of error in that regard, would it be inappropriate use of error in the LSA that it is using versus what we're talking about, the establishment of accurate account balances?</li> <li>A. No. Again, I think the error rate is too narrowly defined to be useful even in that context.</li> <li>Q. And does a qualitative meta-analysis report assist</li> <li>Dr. Scheuren in his opinions with regard to the appropriateness of drawing inferences from the electronic record era to the paper record era?</li> <li>A. I don't believe it provides any reasonable basis for making that conclusion.</li> <li>Q. Why is that?</li> </ul>
00:50:45 , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	Q. Do you recall any discussion by Ms. Herman about how the record and bookkeeping systems among the various regions and agencies were different over time?  A. Yes. She testified that they varied over time and between agencies.  Q. So it would be very difficult in your opinion to reach the conclusion that the paper records era and the electronic records era are sufficiently similar to draw inferences from the electronic era to the paper era, correct?  A. I think that's a fair statement.  Q. Now, Dr. Scheuren indicated that didn't Dr. Scheuren indicate that no additional analysis or testing is necessary in that regard?  A. Dr. Scheuren indicated that there was no additional analysis done in the electronic era.  Q. Did he indicate whether or not additional analysis is necessary?  A. In the electronic era?  Q. Correct.  A. He indicated that it was not.  Q. Now, did Dr. Scheuren take into consideration that the LSA project was designed to estimate risk exposure, not transaction accuracy?  A. No. Again, the notion of the application of the faulty sample design was not addressed as a rebuttal to my opinion by	2 3 4 00:53:09 5 6 7 8 9 00:53:28 10 11 12 13 14 00:53:54 15 16 17 18 19 00:54:10 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Q. But if the LSA sampling was designed for purposes of limiting liability or error, it could be used as a sound basis, could it not?</li> <li>A. If it's limited to the electronic ledger era, and limited to the documents that were available for sampling, then yes.</li> <li>Q. And similarly, couldn't NORC's LSA results for purposes of the litigation support accounting be considered as having an appropriate measure of error?</li> <li>A. I'm sorry, I couldn't hear you over the coughing.</li> <li>Q. With regard to NORC's LSA results, the litigation support accounting results, and its use of error in that regard, would it be inappropriate use of error in the LSA that it is using versus what we're talking about, the establishment of accurate account balances?</li> <li>A. No. Again, I think the error rate is too narrowly defined to be useful even in that context.</li> <li>Q. And does a qualitative meta-analysis report assist</li> <li>Dr. Scheuren in his opinions with regard to the appropriateness of drawing inferences from the electronic record era to the paper record era?</li> <li>A. I don't believe it provides any reasonable basis for making that conclusion.</li> <li>Q. Why is that?</li> <li>A. Well, the meta-analysis, first of all, we obtained some</li> </ul>

	1444		1446
1	information from the meta-analysis. There were many of the	1	that's sound statistical reasoning.
2	things that had been referenced in the meta-analysis that were	2	Q. Now, Dr. Hinkins also stated in her rebuttal that the
3	not provided to us. Of the documents that were provided to us,	3	qualitative meta-analysis report is not central to the sample
4	many of them had missing pages, which from our review appeared	4	design; is that correct?
00:54:40 <b>5</b>	to be pages that were material, that would have potentially	00:57:25 <b>5</b>	A. That's my recollection.
6	influenced the way that that meta-analysis was reviewed.	6	Q. What is your opinion in that regard?
7	But in any event, the documents that we were provided and	7	A. I think it's appropriately relegated to not being central.
8	did look at, many of them were internally inconsistent with the	8	It doesn't provide a reasonable basis, so that's the right spot
9	conclusions that had been reached in the meta-analysis. So I	9	for it.
00:54:55 10	don't feel that the meta-analysis forms a reasonable foundation	00:57:38 10	Q. Is there any other basis for Dr. Scheuren coming to the
11	or basis upon which to make a conclusion that the paper ledger	11	
12	era is the same from a bookkeeping standpoint as the electronic	12	
13	ledger era.	13	
14	Q. Now, I'd like you to look at the fourth demonstrative you	14	A. Well, a meta-analysis I don't think is a reasonable
00:55:13 15	have on the original exhibit, where you actually identified as	00:58:00 15	foundation to make that conclusion, and everything that I have
16	you understood it the NORC solution in redefining the target	16	reviewed is to the contrary.
17	population. Do you recall preparing this demonstrative?	17	•
18	A. I do.	18	prepared here, and that is the error rate is one of the most
19	Q. Could you please explain it?	19	important issues, isn't it?
00:55:31 <b>20</b>	A. Well, this is another area where I think Dr. Hinkins and I	00:58:20 20	•
21	fundamentally are in agreement. I identified this issue prior	00:58:20 20	
22	•	22	
23	to Dr. Hinkins issuing her report, that the target population,	23	, , , , , , ,
24	that there were things missing and omitted from the target  population. And Dr. Hinkins in her rebuttal clarified that in	24	testimony of Dr. Scheuren with respect to the error rate in the LRIS tract history reports?
00:55:49 <b>25</b>	fact that was not what they were calling the target population.	00:58:40 25	· ·
00:55:49 23	Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR	00:58:40 23	Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
	Bryan A. Wayne, KFK, CKK		Biyan A. Wayne, KFK, CKK
	Official Court Penorter		Official Court Penorter
	Official Court Reporter		Official Court Reporter
1	1445	1	1447
1 2	1445 They, NORC, had said the target population is actually the	1 2	1447 Q. Let me identify for purposes of this question a document
2	They, NORC, had said the target population is actually the population from which we drew the sample.	2	Q. Let me identify for purposes of this question a document from the administrative record which has Bates No. 50-2-1. Now,
2	They, NORC, had said the target population is actually the population from which we drew the sample.  And if that's the way you define the target population,	_	1447  Q. Let me identify for purposes of this question a document from the administrative record which has Bates No. 50-2-1. Now, have you reviewed this document, Mr. Duncan?
2 3 4	They, NORC, had said the target population is actually the population from which we drew the sample.  And if that's the way you define the target population, then my criticism falls away. You can actually draw an	2 3 4	Q. Let me identify for purposes of this question a document from the administrative record which has Bates No. 50-2-1. Now, have you reviewed this document, Mr. Duncan?  A. Yes, I have.
2 3 4 00:56:06 5	They, NORC, had said the target population is actually the population from which we drew the sample.  And if that's the way you define the target population, then my criticism falls away. You can actually draw an inference from the population from which you've sampled. So to	2 3 4 00:59:07 <b>5</b>	Q. Let me identify for purposes of this question a document from the administrative record which has Bates No. 50-2-1. Now, have you reviewed this document, Mr. Duncan?  A. Yes, I have.  Q. I'd like you to turn to Bates No. 8. I'd like you to focus
2 3 4 00:56:06 5 6	They, NORC, had said the target population is actually the population from which we drew the sample.  And if that's the way you define the target population, then my criticism falls away. You can actually draw an inference from the population from which you've sampled. So to the extent that NORC is now clearly delineating that the target	2 3 4 00:59:07 5 6	Q. Let me identify for purposes of this question a document from the administrative record which has Bates No. 50-2-1. Now, have you reviewed this document, Mr. Duncan?  A. Yes, I have. Q. I'd like you to turn to Bates No. 8. I'd like you to focus on the statement that is highlighted. It states, "We," which is
2 3 4 00:56:06 5 6 7	They, NORC, had said the target population is actually the population from which we drew the sample.  And if that's the way you define the target population, then my criticism falls away. You can actually draw an inference from the population from which you've sampled. So to the extent that NORC is now clearly delineating that the target population is actually only that population from which the	2 3 4 00:59:07 5 6 7	Q. Let me identify for purposes of this question a document from the administrative record which has Bates No. 50-2-1. Now, have you reviewed this document, Mr. Duncan?  A. Yes, I have. Q. I'd like you to turn to Bates No. 8. I'd like you to focus on the statement that is highlighted. It states, "We," which is NORC, "particularly emphasize our positive results in view of a
2 3 4 00:56:06 5 6	They, NORC, had said the target population is actually the population from which we drew the sample.  And if that's the way you define the target population, then my criticism falls away. You can actually draw an inference from the population from which you've sampled. So to the extent that NORC is now clearly delineating that the target population is actually only that population from which the sample was drawn, then I think everything's fine.	2 3 4 00:59:07 5 6	Q. Let me identify for purposes of this question a document from the administrative record which has Bates No. 50-2-1. Now, have you reviewed this document, Mr. Duncan?  A. Yes, I have. Q. I'd like you to turn to Bates No. 8. I'd like you to focus on the statement that is highlighted. It states, "We," which is
2 3 4 00:56:06 5 6 7 8	They, NORC, had said the target population is actually the population from which we drew the sample.  And if that's the way you define the target population, then my criticism falls away. You can actually draw an inference from the population from which you've sampled. So to the extent that NORC is now clearly delineating that the target population is actually only that population from which the sample was drawn, then I think everything's fine.  Q. It is fine, but it doesn't allow statements with regard to	2 3 4 00:59:07 5 6 7	Q. Let me identify for purposes of this question a document from the administrative record which has Bates No. 50-2-1. Now, have you reviewed this document, Mr. Duncan?  A. Yes, I have. Q. I'd like you to turn to Bates No. 8. I'd like you to focus on the statement that is highlighted. It states, "We," which is NORC, "particularly emphasize our positive results in view of a report on the findings of the TIME project carried out by DataCom in 2000. DataCom asserts an error rate of about 30
2 3 4 00:56:06 5 6 7 8 9	They, NORC, had said the target population is actually the population from which we drew the sample.  And if that's the way you define the target population, then my criticism falls away. You can actually draw an inference from the population from which you've sampled. So to the extent that NORC is now clearly delineating that the target population is actually only that population from which the sample was drawn, then I think everything's fine.  Q. It is fine, but it doesn't allow statements with regard to the accuracy of account balances, does it?	2 3 4 00:59:07 5 6 7 8 9	Q. Let me identify for purposes of this question a document from the administrative record which has Bates No. 50-2-1. Now, have you reviewed this document, Mr. Duncan?  A. Yes, I have. Q. I'd like you to turn to Bates No. 8. I'd like you to focus on the statement that is highlighted. It states, "We," which is NORC, "particularly emphasize our positive results in view of a report on the findings of the TIME project carried out by DataCom in 2000. DataCom asserts an error rate of about 30 percent in postings. NORC has found no evidence of such a
2 3 4 00:56:06 5 6 7 8 9 00:56:25 10	They, NORC, had said the target population is actually the population from which we drew the sample.  And if that's the way you define the target population, then my criticism falls away. You can actually draw an inference from the population from which you've sampled. So to the extent that NORC is now clearly delineating that the target population is actually only that population from which the sample was drawn, then I think everything's fine.  Q. It is fine, but it doesn't allow statements with regard to the accuracy of account balances, does it?	2 3 4 00:59:07 5 6 7 8 9 00:59:35 10	Q. Let me identify for purposes of this question a document from the administrative record which has Bates No. 50-2-1. Now, have you reviewed this document, Mr. Duncan?  A. Yes, I have. Q. I'd like you to turn to Bates No. 8. I'd like you to focus on the statement that is highlighted. It states, "We," which is NORC, "particularly emphasize our positive results in view of a report on the findings of the TIME project carried out by DataCom in 2000. DataCom asserts an error rate of about 30 percent in postings. NORC has found no evidence of such a figure."
2 3 4 00:56:06 5 6 7 8 9 00:56:25 10 11	They, NORC, had said the target population is actually the population from which we drew the sample.  And if that's the way you define the target population, then my criticism falls away. You can actually draw an inference from the population from which you've sampled. So to the extent that NORC is now clearly delineating that the target population is actually only that population from which the sample was drawn, then I think everything's fine.  Q. It is fine, but it doesn't allow statements with regard to the accuracy of account balances, does it?  A. Well, it's fine. It's just irrelevant. I mean it's irrelevant to the real target population, which is all of the	2 3 4 00:59:07 5 6 7 8 9 00:59:35 10	Q. Let me identify for purposes of this question a document from the administrative record which has Bates No. 50-2-1. Now, have you reviewed this document, Mr. Duncan?  A. Yes, I have. Q. I'd like you to turn to Bates No. 8. I'd like you to focus on the statement that is highlighted. It states, "We," which is NORC, "particularly emphasize our positive results in view of a report on the findings of the TIME project carried out by DataCom in 2000. DataCom asserts an error rate of about 30 percent in postings. NORC has found no evidence of such a figure."  Is this an example of the importance of a sound definition
2 3 4 00:56:06 5 6 7 8 9 00:56:25 10 11	They, NORC, had said the target population is actually the population from which we drew the sample.  And if that's the way you define the target population, then my criticism falls away. You can actually draw an inference from the population from which you've sampled. So to the extent that NORC is now clearly delineating that the target population is actually only that population from which the sample was drawn, then I think everything's fine.  Q. It is fine, but it doesn't allow statements with regard to the accuracy of account balances, does it?  A. Well, it's fine. It's just irrelevant. I mean it's irrelevant to the real target population, which is all of the account holders.	2 3 4 00.59.07 5 6 7 8 9 00.59.35 10 11	Q. Let me identify for purposes of this question a document from the administrative record which has Bates No. 50-2-1. Now, have you reviewed this document, Mr. Duncan?  A. Yes, I have. Q. I'd like you to turn to Bates No. 8. I'd like you to focus on the statement that is highlighted. It states, "We," which is NORC, "particularly emphasize our positive results in view of a report on the findings of the TIME project carried out by DataCom in 2000. DataCom asserts an error rate of about 30 percent in postings. NORC has found no evidence of such a figure."  Is this an example of the importance of a sound definition of an error rate?
2 3 4 00:56:06 5 6 7 8 9 00:56:25 10 11 12 13	They, NORC, had said the target population is actually the population from which we drew the sample.  And if that's the way you define the target population, then my criticism falls away. You can actually draw an inference from the population from which you've sampled. So to the extent that NORC is now clearly delineating that the target population is actually only that population from which the sample was drawn, then I think everything's fine.  Q. It is fine, but it doesn't allow statements with regard to the accuracy of account balances, does it?  A. Well, it's fine. It's just irrelevant. I mean it's irrelevant to the real target population, which is all of the account holders.  Q. And that's all the past and present individual Indian trust	2 3 4 00:59:07 5 6 7 8 9 00:59:35 10 11 12 13 14	Q. Let me identify for purposes of this question a document from the administrative record which has Bates No. 50-2-1. Now, have you reviewed this document, Mr. Duncan?  A. Yes, I have. Q. I'd like you to turn to Bates No. 8. I'd like you to focus on the statement that is highlighted. It states, "We," which is NORC, "particularly emphasize our positive results in view of a report on the findings of the TIME project carried out by DataCom in 2000. DataCom asserts an error rate of about 30 percent in postings. NORC has found no evidence of such a figure."  Is this an example of the importance of a sound definition of an error rate?  A. Yes. This goes on to say that "such stark differences with
2 3 4 00:56:06 5 6 7 8 9 00:56:25 10 11 12 13	They, NORC, had said the target population is actually the population from which we drew the sample.  And if that's the way you define the target population, then my criticism falls away. You can actually draw an inference from the population from which you've sampled. So to the extent that NORC is now clearly delineating that the target population is actually only that population from which the sample was drawn, then I think everything's fine.  Q. It is fine, but it doesn't allow statements with regard to the accuracy of account balances, does it?  A. Well, it's fine. It's just irrelevant. I mean it's irrelevant to the real target population, which is all of the account holders.	2 3 4 00:59:07 5 6 7 8 9 00:59:35 10 11 12 13	Q. Let me identify for purposes of this question a document from the administrative record which has Bates No. 50-2-1. Now, have you reviewed this document, Mr. Duncan?  A. Yes, I have. Q. I'd like you to turn to Bates No. 8. I'd like you to focus on the statement that is highlighted. It states, "We," which is NORC, "particularly emphasize our positive results in view of a report on the findings of the TIME project carried out by DataCom in 2000. DataCom asserts an error rate of about 30 percent in postings. NORC has found no evidence of such a figure."  Is this an example of the importance of a sound definition of an error rate?  A. Yes. This goes on to say that "such stark differences with our findings are not explained by statistical variance alone."
2 3 4 00:56:06 5 6 7 8 9 00:56:25 10 11 12 13 14 00:56:37 15	They, NORC, had said the target population is actually the population from which we drew the sample.  And if that's the way you define the target population, then my criticism falls away. You can actually draw an inference from the population from which you've sampled. So to the extent that NORC is now clearly delineating that the target population is actually only that population from which the sample was drawn, then I think everything's fine.  Q. It is fine, but it doesn't allow statements with regard to the accuracy of account balances, does it?  A. Well, it's fine. It's just irrelevant. I mean it's irrelevant to the real target population, which is all of the account holders.  Q. And that's all the past and present individual Indian trust beneficiaries, is that your understanding?  A. That's my understanding.	2 3 4 00.59.07 5 6 7 8 9 00.59.35 10 11 12 13 14 00.59.52 15	Q. Let me identify for purposes of this question a document from the administrative record which has Bates No. 50-2-1. Now, have you reviewed this document, Mr. Duncan?  A. Yes, I have. Q. I'd like you to turn to Bates No. 8. I'd like you to focus on the statement that is highlighted. It states, "We," which is NORC, "particularly emphasize our positive results in view of a report on the findings of the TIME project carried out by DataCom in 2000. DataCom asserts an error rate of about 30 percent in postings. NORC has found no evidence of such a figure."  Is this an example of the importance of a sound definition of an error rate?  A. Yes. This goes on to say that "such stark differences with our findings are not explained by statistical variance alone."  That's absolutely correct. This is definitional. If an
2 3 4 00:56:06 5 6 7 8 9 00:56:25 10 11 12 13 14 00:56:37 15 16 17	They, NORC, had said the target population is actually the population from which we drew the sample.  And if that's the way you define the target population, then my criticism falls away. You can actually draw an inference from the population from which you've sampled. So to the extent that NORC is now clearly delineating that the target population is actually only that population from which the sample was drawn, then I think everything's fine.  Q. It is fine, but it doesn't allow statements with regard to the accuracy of account balances, does it?  A. Well, it's fine. It's just irrelevant. I mean it's irrelevant to the real target population, which is all of the account holders.  Q. And that's all the past and present individual Indian trust beneficiaries, is that your understanding?  A. That's my understanding.  Q. Does the target population sample allow NORC or the	2 3 4 00:59:07 5 6 7 8 9 00:59:35 10 11 12 13 14 00:59:52 15 16	Q. Let me identify for purposes of this question a document from the administrative record which has Bates No. 50-2-1. Now, have you reviewed this document, Mr. Duncan?  A. Yes, I have. Q. I'd like you to turn to Bates No. 8. I'd like you to focus on the statement that is highlighted. It states, "We," which is NORC, "particularly emphasize our positive results in view of a report on the findings of the TIME project carried out by DataCom in 2000. DataCom asserts an error rate of about 30 percent in postings. NORC has found no evidence of such a figure."  Is this an example of the importance of a sound definition of an error rate?  A. Yes. This goes on to say that "such stark differences with our findings are not explained by statistical variance alone."  That's absolutely correct. This is definitional. If an error if many of the things were defined as an error from the
2 3 4 00:56:06 5 6 7 8 9 00:56:25 10 11 12 13 14 00:56:37 15 16	They, NORC, had said the target population is actually the population from which we drew the sample.  And if that's the way you define the target population, then my criticism falls away. You can actually draw an inference from the population from which you've sampled. So to the extent that NORC is now clearly delineating that the target population is actually only that population from which the sample was drawn, then I think everything's fine.  Q. It is fine, but it doesn't allow statements with regard to the accuracy of account balances, does it?  A. Well, it's fine. It's just irrelevant. I mean it's irrelevant to the real target population, which is all of the account holders.  Q. And that's all the past and present individual Indian trust beneficiaries, is that your understanding?  A. That's my understanding.  Q. Does the target population sample allow NORC or the defendants to make a statement about the account balances for	2 3 4 00:59:07 5 6 7 8 9 00:59:35 10 11 12 13 14 00:59:52 15 16 17	Q. Let me identify for purposes of this question a document from the administrative record which has Bates No. 50-2-1. Now, have you reviewed this document, Mr. Duncan?  A. Yes, I have. Q. I'd like you to turn to Bates No. 8. I'd like you to focus on the statement that is highlighted. It states, "We," which is NORC, "particularly emphasize our positive results in view of a report on the findings of the TIME project carried out by DataCom in 2000. DataCom asserts an error rate of about 30 percent in postings. NORC has found no evidence of such a figure."  Is this an example of the importance of a sound definition of an error rate?  A. Yes. This goes on to say that "such stark differences with our findings are not explained by statistical variance alone."  That's absolutely correct. This is definitional. If an error if many of the things were defined as an error from the standpoint of DataCom but not from the standpoint of NORC,
2 3 4 00:56:06 5 6 7 8 9 00:56:25 10 11 12 13 14 00:56:37 15 16 17 18 19	They, NORC, had said the target population is actually the population from which we drew the sample.  And if that's the way you define the target population, then my criticism falls away. You can actually draw an inference from the population from which you've sampled. So to the extent that NORC is now clearly delineating that the target population is actually only that population from which the sample was drawn, then I think everything's fine.  Q. It is fine, but it doesn't allow statements with regard to the accuracy of account balances, does it?  A. Well, it's fine. It's just irrelevant. I mean it's irrelevant to the real target population, which is all of the account holders.  Q. And that's all the past and present individual Indian trust beneficiaries, is that your understanding?  A. That's my understanding.  Q. Does the target population sample allow NORC or the defendants to make a statement about the account balances for its new target population?	2 3 4 00:59:07 5 6 7 8 9 00:59:35 10 11 12 13 14 00:59:52 15 16 17 18	Q. Let me identify for purposes of this question a document from the administrative record which has Bates No. 50-2-1. Now, have you reviewed this document, Mr. Duncan?  A. Yes, I have. Q. I'd like you to turn to Bates No. 8. I'd like you to focus on the statement that is highlighted. It states, "We," which is NORC, "particularly emphasize our positive results in view of a report on the findings of the TIME project carried out by DataCom in 2000. DataCom asserts an error rate of about 30 percent in postings. NORC has found no evidence of such a figure."  Is this an example of the importance of a sound definition of an error rate?  A. Yes. This goes on to say that "such stark differences with our findings are not explained by statistical variance alone."  That's absolutely correct. This is definitional. If an error if many of the things were defined as an error from the standpoint of DataCom but not from the standpoint of NORC, that's how you can get these kinds of stark contrasts.
2 3 4 00:56:06 5 6 7 8 9 00:56:25 10 11 12 13 14 00:56:37 15 16 17	They, NORC, had said the target population is actually the population from which we drew the sample.  And if that's the way you define the target population, then my criticism falls away. You can actually draw an inference from the population from which you've sampled. So to the extent that NORC is now clearly delineating that the target population is actually only that population from which the sample was drawn, then I think everything's fine.  Q. It is fine, but it doesn't allow statements with regard to the accuracy of account balances, does it?  A. Well, it's fine. It's just irrelevant. I mean it's irrelevant to the real target population, which is all of the account holders.  Q. And that's all the past and present individual Indian trust beneficiaries, is that your understanding?  A. That's my understanding.  Q. Does the target population sample allow NORC or the defendants to make a statement about the account balances for its new target population?  A. Not for the account balances. It's still going to be	2 3 4 00:59:07 5 6 7 8 9 00:59:35 10 11 12 13 14 00:59:52 15 16 17	Q. Let me identify for purposes of this question a document from the administrative record which has Bates No. 50-2-1. Now, have you reviewed this document, Mr. Duncan?  A. Yes, I have. Q. I'd like you to turn to Bates No. 8. I'd like you to focus on the statement that is highlighted. It states, "We," which is NORC, "particularly emphasize our positive results in view of a report on the findings of the TIME project carried out by DataCom in 2000. DataCom asserts an error rate of about 30 percent in postings. NORC has found no evidence of such a figure."  Is this an example of the importance of a sound definition of an error rate?  A. Yes. This goes on to say that "such stark differences with our findings are not explained by statistical variance alone."  That's absolutely correct. This is definitional. If an error if many of the things were defined as an error from the standpoint of DataCom but not from the standpoint of NORC, that's how you can get these kinds of stark contrasts.  Q. And the contrasts as a result of a narrowly defined error
2 3 4 00:56:06 5 6 7 8 9 00:56:25 10 11 12 13 14 00:56:37 15 16 17 18 19 00:56:52 20 21	They, NORC, had said the target population is actually the population from which we drew the sample.  And if that's the way you define the target population, then my criticism falls away. You can actually draw an inference from the population from which you've sampled. So to the extent that NORC is now clearly delineating that the target population is actually only that population from which the sample was drawn, then I think everything's fine.  Q. It is fine, but it doesn't allow statements with regard to the accuracy of account balances, does it?  A. Well, it's fine. It's just irrelevant. I mean it's irrelevant to the real target population, which is all of the account holders.  Q. And that's all the past and present individual Indian trust beneficiaries, is that your understanding?  A. That's my understanding.  Q. Does the target population sample allow NORC or the defendants to make a statement about the account balances for its new target population?  A. Not for the account balances. It's still going to be limited to account transactions.	2 3 4 00:59:07 5 6 7 8 9 00:59:35 10 11 12 13 14 00:59:52 15 16 17 18 19 01:00:13 20 21	Q. Let me identify for purposes of this question a document from the administrative record which has Bates No. 50-2-1. Now, have you reviewed this document, Mr. Duncan?  A. Yes, I have. Q. I'd like you to turn to Bates No. 8. I'd like you to focus on the statement that is highlighted. It states, "We," which is NORC, "particularly emphasize our positive results in view of a report on the findings of the TIME project carried out by DataCom in 2000. DataCom asserts an error rate of about 30 percent in postings. NORC has found no evidence of such a figure."  Is this an example of the importance of a sound definition of an error rate?  A. Yes. This goes on to say that "such stark differences with our findings are not explained by statistical variance alone."  That's absolutely correct. This is definitional. If an error if many of the things were defined as an error from the standpoint of DataCom but not from the standpoint of NORC, that's how you can get these kinds of stark contrasts.  Q. And the contrasts as a result of a narrowly defined error rate provide meaningless results for a trust beneficiary,
2 3 4 00:56:06 5 6 7 8 9 00:56:25 10 11 12 13 14 00:56:37 15 16 17 18 19 00:56:52 20 21 22	They, NORC, had said the target population is actually the population from which we drew the sample.  And if that's the way you define the target population, then my criticism falls away. You can actually draw an inference from the population from which you've sampled. So to the extent that NORC is now clearly delineating that the target population is actually only that population from which the sample was drawn, then I think everything's fine.  Q. It is fine, but it doesn't allow statements with regard to the accuracy of account balances, does it?  A. Well, it's fine. It's just irrelevant. I mean it's irrelevant to the real target population, which is all of the account holders.  Q. And that's all the past and present individual Indian trust beneficiaries, is that your understanding?  A. That's my understanding.  Q. Does the target population sample allow NORC or the defendants to make a statement about the account balances for its new target population?  A. Not for the account balances. It's still going to be limited to account transactions.  Q. And so notwithstanding that, you don't have any	2 3 4 00:59:07 5 6 7 8 9 00:59:35 10 11 12 13 14 00:59:52 15 16 17 18 19 01:00:13 20	Q. Let me identify for purposes of this question a document from the administrative record which has Bates No. 50-2-1. Now, have you reviewed this document, Mr. Duncan?  A. Yes, I have. Q. I'd like you to turn to Bates No. 8. I'd like you to focus on the statement that is highlighted. It states, "We," which is NORC, "particularly emphasize our positive results in view of a report on the findings of the TIME project carried out by DataCom in 2000. DataCom asserts an error rate of about 30 percent in postings. NORC has found no evidence of such a figure."  Is this an example of the importance of a sound definition of an error rate?  A. Yes. This goes on to say that "such stark differences with our findings are not explained by statistical variance alone."  That's absolutely correct. This is definitional. If an error if many of the things were defined as an error from the standpoint of DataCom but not from the standpoint of NORC, that's how you can get these kinds of stark contrasts.  Q. And the contrasts as a result of a narrowly defined error rate provide meaningless results for a trust beneficiary, correct?
2 3 4 00:56:06 5 6 7 8 9 00:56:25 10 11 12 13 14 00:56:37 15 16 17 18 19 00:56:52 20 21 22 23	They, NORC, had said the target population is actually the population from which we drew the sample.  And if that's the way you define the target population, then my criticism falls away. You can actually draw an inference from the population from which you've sampled. So to the extent that NORC is now clearly delineating that the target population is actually only that population from which the sample was drawn, then I think everything's fine.  Q. It is fine, but it doesn't allow statements with regard to the accuracy of account balances, does it?  A. Well, it's fine. It's just irrelevant. I mean it's irrelevant to the real target population, which is all of the account holders.  Q. And that's all the past and present individual Indian trust beneficiaries, is that your understanding?  A. That's my understanding.  Q. Does the target population sample allow NORC or the defendants to make a statement about the account balances for its new target population?  A. Not for the account balances. It's still going to be limited to account transactions.  Q. And so notwithstanding that, you don't have any disagreement with what Dr. Hinkins stated, correct?	2 3 4 00.59.07 5 6 7 8 9 00.59.35 10 11 12 13 14 00.59.52 15 16 17 18 19 01:00:13 20 21 22	Q. Let me identify for purposes of this question a document from the administrative record which has Bates No. 50-2-1. Now, have you reviewed this document, Mr. Duncan?  A. Yes, I have. Q. I'd like you to turn to Bates No. 8. I'd like you to focus on the statement that is highlighted. It states, "We," which is NORC, "particularly emphasize our positive results in view of a report on the findings of the TIME project carried out by DataCom in 2000. DataCom asserts an error rate of about 30 percent in postings. NORC has found no evidence of such a figure."  Is this an example of the importance of a sound definition of an error rate?  A. Yes. This goes on to say that "such stark differences with our findings are not explained by statistical variance alone."  That's absolutely correct. This is definitional. If an error if many of the things were defined as an error from the standpoint of DataCom but not from the standpoint of NORC, that's how you can get these kinds of stark contrasts.  Q. And the contrasts as a result of a narrowly defined error rate provide meaningless results for a trust beneficiary, correct?  A. It's my conclusion that the way these error rates have been
2 3 4 00:56:06 5 6 7 8 9 00:56:25 10 11 12 13 14 00:56:37 15 16 17 18 19 00:56:52 20 21 22	They, NORC, had said the target population is actually the population from which we drew the sample.  And if that's the way you define the target population, then my criticism falls away. You can actually draw an inference from the population from which you've sampled. So to the extent that NORC is now clearly delineating that the target population is actually only that population from which the sample was drawn, then I think everything's fine.  Q. It is fine, but it doesn't allow statements with regard to the accuracy of account balances, does it?  A. Well, it's fine. It's just irrelevant. I mean it's irrelevant to the real target population, which is all of the account holders.  Q. And that's all the past and present individual Indian trust beneficiaries, is that your understanding?  A. That's my understanding.  Q. Does the target population sample allow NORC or the defendants to make a statement about the account balances for its new target population?  A. Not for the account balances. It's still going to be limited to account transactions.  Q. And so notwithstanding that, you don't have any	2 3 4 00:59:07 5 6 7 8 9 00:59:35 10 11 12 13 14 00:59:52 15 16 17 18 19 01:00:13 20 21 22 23	Q. Let me identify for purposes of this question a document from the administrative record which has Bates No. 50-2-1. Now, have you reviewed this document, Mr. Duncan?  A. Yes, I have. Q. I'd like you to turn to Bates No. 8. I'd like you to focus on the statement that is highlighted. It states, "We," which is NORC, "particularly emphasize our positive results in view of a report on the findings of the TIME project carried out by DataCom in 2000. DataCom asserts an error rate of about 30 percent in postings. NORC has found no evidence of such a figure."  Is this an example of the importance of a sound definition of an error rate?  A. Yes. This goes on to say that "such stark differences with our findings are not explained by statistical variance alone."  That's absolutely correct. This is definitional. If an error if many of the things were defined as an error from the standpoint of DataCom but not from the standpoint of NORC, that's how you can get these kinds of stark contrasts.  Q. And the contrasts as a result of a narrowly defined error rate provide meaningless results for a trust beneficiary, correct?  A. It's my conclusion that the way these error rates have been

Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR

Official Court Reporter

Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR

Official Court Reporter

	1448		1450
1 1	analysis is unfounded.	1	Your Honor, of cross-examination. I'm sorry. The direct
2	Q. I would like to ask you if you agree on one final opinion	2	examination is completed. We'd like to move into evidence
3	with something that Dr. Scheuren stated. And I'd like to pull	3	Mr. Duncan's expert report and his expert rebuttal report.
4	up for purposes of this question Bates 57-32-1. This is the	4	THE COURT: All right. They'll be received.
01:00:51 5	straw man pretest. Do you recall reviewing this document?	5	(Plaintiff Exhibit Nos. PPX
6	A. I do.	6	4284, 4484 received into evidence.)
7	Q. First of all, do you have any understanding of what the	7	MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, one more we would like to
8	straw man pretest is about, based on your review of it?	8	try and move into evidence, which is the demonstrative
9	A. My review of this document indicates to me that this is an	9	identified as PPX 4486, which is compiled based on the DCV
01:01:06 10	attempt to the notion of a straw man is to put up an argument	01:03:59 10	information provided in the September 30, 2007, FTI DCV report
11	that can be fought. Generally speaking that argument is a	11	and testimony from Ms. Herman.
12	fallacy. It's meant to distract. But it's really just to put	12	THE COURT: That will be received.
13	something up that everyone can take shots at.	13	MR. GINGOLD: Thank you, Your Honor.
14	Q. And I'd like you to pay particular attention to page 2,	14	MR. WARSHAWSKY: For the record, we object. It's
01:01:28 15	Bates No. 2. And the last sentence in the second paragraph.	01:04:17 15	demonstrative. It's not substantive evidence.
16	Dr. Scheuren stated that he prepared this document, and it	16	THE COURT: It'll be received. It'll be part of the
17	states, "Clearly we are not talking about the standards used in	17	record. It'll be received as demonstrative evidence. How does
18	a court case."	18	that sound?
19	Would it be your understanding that the standards that are	19	MR. WARSHAWSKY: Sounds perfect.
01:01:50 <b>20</b>	being used with regard to the statistical sampling are not	01:04:34 <b>20</b>	(Plaintiff Exhibit No. PPX
21	standards that would allow a trust beneficiary to receive an	21	4486 received into evidence.)
22	accurate statement of his account balances?	22	THE COURT: All right. Mr. Warshawsky, you may
23	A. That is precisely my opinion.	23	cross-examine.
24	Q. Would it be your opinion that the standards used	24	MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, there's one more, I'm sorry.
01:02:09 <b>25</b>	THE COURT: Let him give his opinion instead of you	01:04:46 <b>25</b>	THE COURT: Somebody get the hook.
01.52.55	Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR	0	Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
	Official Court Reporter		Official Court Reporter
	1449		 1451
1	stating it and asking him to say yes or no. I mean this is sort	1	MR. GINGOLD: Oh, I'm sorry. Okay.
2	of the ultimate question.	2	THE COURT: No, no. Go ahead. I'm just kidding.
3	BY MR. GINGOLD:	3	Obviously, you smiled, though, Mr. Gingold. You have a nice
4	Q. Explain your opinion.	4	
01:02:19 <b>5</b>		4	smile.
01:02:19	THE COURT: Thank you.	01:04:58 5	smile.  MR. GINGOLD: Thank you, Your Honor. PPX 4468, which
6	THE COURT: Thank you.  THE WITNESS: The fundamental premise is what is the	_	
		01:04:58 <b>5</b>	MR. GINGOLD: Thank you, Your Honor. PPX 4468, which
6	THE WITNESS: The fundamental premise is what is the	01:04:58 5	MR. GINGOLD: Thank you, Your Honor. PPX 4468, which is a document entitled "The Treasury Department's role in the
6 7	THE WITNESS: The fundamental premise is what is the reconciliation, has something been reconciled or not, and is it	01:04:58 <b>5 6 7</b>	MR. GINGOLD: Thank you, Your Honor. PPX 4468, which is a document entitled "The Treasury Department's role in the administration of tribal trust funds." It's a Morgan Angel
6 7 8	THE WITNESS: The fundamental premise is what is the reconciliation, has something been reconciled or not, and is it an error or is it not. And at the end of the day the statements	01:04:58 <b>5 6 7 8</b>	MR. GINGOLD: Thank you, Your Honor. PPX 4468, which is a document entitled "The Treasury Department's role in the administration of tribal trust funds." It's a Morgan Angel report dated April 16, 2004.
6 7 8 9	THE WITNESS: The fundamental premise is what is the reconciliation, has something been reconciled or not, and is it an error or is it not. And at the end of the day the statements that are going to be able to be made from the statistical	01:04:58 <b>5</b> 6 7 8 9	MR. GINGOLD: Thank you, Your Honor. PPX 4468, which is a document entitled "The Treasury Department's role in the administration of tribal trust funds." It's a Morgan Angel report dated April 16, 2004.  MR. WARSHAWSKY: Your Honor, we object again. This is
6 7 8 9 01:02:32 <b>10</b>	THE WITNESS: The fundamental premise is what is the reconciliation, has something been reconciled or not, and is it an error or is it not. And at the end of the day the statements that are going to be able to be made from the statistical sampling that was done and from the reconciliation efforts that	01:04:58 <b>5</b> 6 7 8 9 01:05:25 <b>10</b>	MR. GINGOLD: Thank you, Your Honor. PPX 4468, which is a document entitled "The Treasury Department's role in the administration of tribal trust funds." It's a Morgan Angel report dated April 16, 2004.  MR. WARSHAWSKY: Your Honor, we object again. This is a draft document. It was prepared for Treasury. It's not
6 7 8 9 01:02:32 10	THE WITNESS: The fundamental premise is what is the reconciliation, has something been reconciled or not, and is it an error or is it not. And at the end of the day the statements that are going to be able to be made from the statistical sampling that was done and from the reconciliation efforts that were done will not provide results that really would have any	01:04:58	MR. GINGOLD: Thank you, Your Honor. PPX 4468, which is a document entitled "The Treasury Department's role in the administration of tribal trust funds." It's a Morgan Angel report dated April 16, 2004.  MR. WARSHAWSKY: Your Honor, we object again. This is a draft document. It was prepared for Treasury. It's not probative or relevant to the issues.
6 7 8 9 01:02:32 10 11 12	THE WITNESS: The fundamental premise is what is the reconciliation, has something been reconciled or not, and is it an error or is it not. And at the end of the day the statements that are going to be able to be made from the statistical sampling that was done and from the reconciliation efforts that were done will not provide results that really would have any meaning to the individual account holder.	01:04:58	MR. GINGOLD: Thank you, Your Honor. PPX 4468, which is a document entitled "The Treasury Department's role in the administration of tribal trust funds." It's a Morgan Angel report dated April 16, 2004.  MR. WARSHAWSKY: Your Honor, we object again. This is a draft document. It was prepared for Treasury. It's not probative or relevant to the issues.  MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, all Morgan Angel Ed Angel
6 7 8 9 01:02:32 10 11 12 13	THE WITNESS: The fundamental premise is what is the reconciliation, has something been reconciled or not, and is it an error or is it not. And at the end of the day the statements that are going to be able to be made from the statistical sampling that was done and from the reconciliation efforts that were done will not provide results that really would have any meaning to the individual account holder.  They don't have any understanding of whether or not their	01:04:58	MR. GINGOLD: Thank you, Your Honor. PPX 4468, which is a document entitled "The Treasury Department's role in the administration of tribal trust funds." It's a Morgan Angel report dated April 16, 2004.  MR. WARSHAWSKY: Your Honor, we object again. This is a draft document. It was prepared for Treasury. It's not probative or relevant to the issues.  MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, all Morgan Angel Ed Angel testified that they routinely prepare their documents in draft
6 7 8 9 01:02:32 10 11 12 13 14	THE WITNESS: The fundamental premise is what is the reconciliation, has something been reconciled or not, and is it an error or is it not. And at the end of the day the statements that are going to be able to be made from the statistical sampling that was done and from the reconciliation efforts that were done will not provide results that really would have any meaning to the individual account holder.  They don't have any understanding of whether or not their balance is correctly stated. There's going to be some level of	01:04:58	MR. GINGOLD: Thank you, Your Honor. PPX 4468, which is a document entitled "The Treasury Department's role in the administration of tribal trust funds." It's a Morgan Angel report dated April 16, 2004.  MR. WARSHAWSKY: Your Honor, we object again. This is a draft document. It was prepared for Treasury. It's not probative or relevant to the issues.  MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, all Morgan Angel Ed Angel testified that they routinely prepare their documents in draft until they're otherwise told by the Defendants to produce them.
6 7 8 9 01:02:32 10 11 12 13 14 01:02:46 15	THE WITNESS: The fundamental premise is what is the reconciliation, has something been reconciled or not, and is it an error or is it not. And at the end of the day the statements that are going to be able to be made from the statistical sampling that was done and from the reconciliation efforts that were done will not provide results that really would have any meaning to the individual account holder.  They don't have any understanding of whether or not their balance is correctly stated. There's going to be some level of assurance that the transactions are probably correct, but at the	01:04:58	MR. GINGOLD: Thank you, Your Honor. PPX 4468, which is a document entitled "The Treasury Department's role in the administration of tribal trust funds." It's a Morgan Angel report dated April 16, 2004.  MR. WARSHAWSKY: Your Honor, we object again. This is a draft document. It was prepared for Treasury. It's not probative or relevant to the issues.  MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, all Morgan Angel Ed Angel testified that they routinely prepare their documents in draft until they're otherwise told by the Defendants to produce them.  THE COURT: Do we know what this is? This is a draft.
6 7 8 9 01:02:32 10 11 12 13 14 01:02:46 15	THE WITNESS: The fundamental premise is what is the reconciliation, has something been reconciled or not, and is it an error or is it not. And at the end of the day the statements that are going to be able to be made from the statistical sampling that was done and from the reconciliation efforts that were done will not provide results that really would have any meaning to the individual account holder.  They don't have any understanding of whether or not their balance is correctly stated. There's going to be some level of assurance that the transactions are probably correct, but at the end of the day, as far as providing information to the	01:04:58	MR. GINGOLD: Thank you, Your Honor. PPX 4468, which is a document entitled "The Treasury Department's role in the administration of tribal trust funds." It's a Morgan Angel report dated April 16, 2004.  MR. WARSHAWSKY: Your Honor, we object again. This is a draft document. It was prepared for Treasury. It's not probative or relevant to the issues.  MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, all Morgan Angel Ed Angel testified that they routinely prepare their documents in draft until they're otherwise told by the Defendants to produce them.  THE COURT: Do we know what this is? This is a draft. Everybody agree this is a draft?
6 7 8 9 01:02:32 10 11 12 13 14 01:02:46 15 16 17	THE WITNESS: The fundamental premise is what is the reconciliation, has something been reconciled or not, and is it an error or is it not. And at the end of the day the statements that are going to be able to be made from the statistical sampling that was done and from the reconciliation efforts that were done will not provide results that really would have any meaning to the individual account holder.  They don't have any understanding of whether or not their balance is correctly stated. There's going to be some level of assurance that the transactions are probably correct, but at the end of the day, as far as providing information to the individual account holder on their account, I would contend, it	01:04:58	MR. GINGOLD: Thank you, Your Honor. PPX 4468, which is a document entitled "The Treasury Department's role in the administration of tribal trust funds." It's a Morgan Angel report dated April 16, 2004.  MR. WARSHAWSKY: Your Honor, we object again. This is a draft document. It was prepared for Treasury. It's not probative or relevant to the issues.  MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, all Morgan Angel Ed Angel testified that they routinely prepare their documents in draft until they're otherwise told by the Defendants to produce them.  THE COURT: Do we know what this is? This is a draft.  Everybody agree this is a draft?  MR. GINGOLD: No, Your Honor. We do not. They
6 7 8 9 01:02:32 10 11 12 13 14 01:02:46 15 16 17 18	THE WITNESS: The fundamental premise is what is the reconciliation, has something been reconciled or not, and is it an error or is it not. And at the end of the day the statements that are going to be able to be made from the statistical sampling that was done and from the reconciliation efforts that were done will not provide results that really would have any meaning to the individual account holder.  They don't have any understanding of whether or not their balance is correctly stated. There's going to be some level of assurance that the transactions are probably correct, but at the end of the day, as far as providing information to the individual account holder on their account, I would contend, it is my opinion, that the information that's being prepared as	01:04:58 5 6 7 8 9 01:05:25 10 11 12 13 14 01:05:42 15 16 17 18	MR. GINGOLD: Thank you, Your Honor. PPX 4468, which is a document entitled "The Treasury Department's role in the administration of tribal trust funds." It's a Morgan Angel report dated April 16, 2004.  MR. WARSHAWSKY: Your Honor, we object again. This is a draft document. It was prepared for Treasury. It's not probative or relevant to the issues.  MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, all Morgan Angel Ed Angel testified that they routinely prepare their documents in draft until they're otherwise told by the Defendants to produce them.  THE COURT: Do we know what this is? This is a draft.  Everybody agree this is a draft?  MR. GINGOLD: No, Your Honor. We do not. They routinely dub their documents draft documents. The testimony
6 7 8 9 01:02:32 10 11 12 13 14 01:02:46 15 16 17 18 19	THE WITNESS: The fundamental premise is what is the reconciliation, has something been reconciled or not, and is it an error or is it not. And at the end of the day the statements that are going to be able to be made from the statistical sampling that was done and from the reconciliation efforts that were done will not provide results that really would have any meaning to the individual account holder.  They don't have any understanding of whether or not their balance is correctly stated. There's going to be some level of assurance that the transactions are probably correct, but at the end of the day, as far as providing information to the individual account holder on their account, I would contend, it is my opinion, that the information that's being prepared as part of the 2007 Plan would be meaningless.	01:04:58 5 6 7 8 9 01:05:25 10 11 12 13 14 01:05:42 15 16 17 18 19	MR. GINGOLD: Thank you, Your Honor. PPX 4468, which is a document entitled "The Treasury Department's role in the administration of tribal trust funds." It's a Morgan Angel report dated April 16, 2004.  MR. WARSHAWSKY: Your Honor, we object again. This is a draft document. It was prepared for Treasury. It's not probative or relevant to the issues.  MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, all Morgan Angel Ed Angel testified that they routinely prepare their documents in draft until they're otherwise told by the Defendants to produce them.  THE COURT: Do we know what this is? This is a draft. Everybody agree this is a draft?  MR. GINGOLD: No, Your Honor. We do not. They routinely dub their documents draft documents. The testimony is, not only before this court in this current proceeding, but
01:02:32 10 11 12 13 14 01:02:46 15 16 17 18 19 01:03:07 20	THE WITNESS: The fundamental premise is what is the reconciliation, has something been reconciled or not, and is it an error or is it not. And at the end of the day the statements that are going to be able to be made from the statistical sampling that was done and from the reconciliation efforts that were done will not provide results that really would have any meaning to the individual account holder.  They don't have any understanding of whether or not their balance is correctly stated. There's going to be some level of assurance that the transactions are probably correct, but at the end of the day, as far as providing information to the individual account holder on their account, I would contend, it is my opinion, that the information that's being prepared as part of the 2007 Plan would be meaningless.  MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, our cross-examination is	01:04:58	MR. GINGOLD: Thank you, Your Honor. PPX 4468, which is a document entitled "The Treasury Department's role in the administration of tribal trust funds." It's a Morgan Angel report dated April 16, 2004.  MR. WARSHAWSKY: Your Honor, we object again. This is a draft document. It was prepared for Treasury. It's not probative or relevant to the issues.  MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, all Morgan Angel Ed Angel testified that they routinely prepare their documents in draft until they're otherwise told by the Defendants to produce them.  THE COURT: Do we know what this is? This is a draft. Everybody agree this is a draft?  MR. GINGOLD: No, Your Honor. We do not. They routinely dub their documents draft documents. The testimony is, not only before this court in this current proceeding, but in the trial 1.5, Mr. Angel repeatedly responded to questions of
6 7 8 9 01:02:32 10 11 12 13 14 01:02:46 15 16 17 18 19 01:03:07 20 21	THE WITNESS: The fundamental premise is what is the reconciliation, has something been reconciled or not, and is it an error or is it not. And at the end of the day the statements that are going to be able to be made from the statistical sampling that was done and from the reconciliation efforts that were done will not provide results that really would have any meaning to the individual account holder.  They don't have any understanding of whether or not their balance is correctly stated. There's going to be some level of assurance that the transactions are probably correct, but at the end of the day, as far as providing information to the individual account holder on their account, I would contend, it is my opinion, that the information that's being prepared as part of the 2007 Plan would be meaningless.  MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, our cross-examination is completed. I would like to move into evidence	01:04:58 5 6 7 8 9 01:05:25 10 11 12 13 14 01:05:42 15 16 17 18 19 01:05:55 20 21	MR. GINGOLD: Thank you, Your Honor. PPX 4468, which is a document entitled "The Treasury Department's role in the administration of tribal trust funds." It's a Morgan Angel report dated April 16, 2004.  MR. WARSHAWSKY: Your Honor, we object again. This is a draft document. It was prepared for Treasury. It's not probative or relevant to the issues.  MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, all Morgan Angel Ed Angel testified that they routinely prepare their documents in draft until they're otherwise told by the Defendants to produce them.  THE COURT: Do we know what this is? This is a draft.  Everybody agree this is a draft?  MR. GINGOLD: No, Your Honor. We do not. They routinely dub their documents draft documents. The testimony is, not only before this court in this current proceeding, but in the trial 1.5, Mr. Angel repeatedly responded to questions of Mr. Harper that they routinely dub all their documents draft
6 7 8 9 01:02:32 10 11 12 13 14 01:02:46 15 16 17 18 19 01:03:07 20 21 22	THE WITNESS: The fundamental premise is what is the reconciliation, has something been reconciled or not, and is it an error or is it not. And at the end of the day the statements that are going to be able to be made from the statistical sampling that was done and from the reconciliation efforts that were done will not provide results that really would have any meaning to the individual account holder.  They don't have any understanding of whether or not their balance is correctly stated. There's going to be some level of assurance that the transactions are probably correct, but at the end of the day, as far as providing information to the individual account holder on their account, I would contend, it is my opinion, that the information that's being prepared as part of the 2007 Plan would be meaningless.  MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, our cross-examination is completed. I would like to move into evidence	01:04:58 5 6 7 8 9 01:05:25 10 11 12 13 14 01:05:42 15 16 17 18 19 01:05:55 20 21 22	MR. GINGOLD: Thank you, Your Honor. PPX 4468, which is a document entitled "The Treasury Department's role in the administration of tribal trust funds." It's a Morgan Angel report dated April 16, 2004.  MR. WARSHAWSKY: Your Honor, we object again. This is a draft document. It was prepared for Treasury. It's not probative or relevant to the issues.  MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, all Morgan Angel Ed Angel testified that they routinely prepare their documents in draft until they're otherwise told by the Defendants to produce them.  THE COURT: Do we know what this is? This is a draft. Everybody agree this is a draft?  MR. GINGOLD: No, Your Honor. We do not. They routinely dub their documents draft documents. The testimony is, not only before this court in this current proceeding, but in the trial 1.5, Mr. Angel repeatedly responded to questions of Mr. Harper that they routinely dub all their documents draft documents.
6 7 8 9 01:02:32 10 11 12 13 14 01:02:46 15 16 17 18 19 01:03:07 20 21 22 23	THE WITNESS: The fundamental premise is what is the reconciliation, has something been reconciled or not, and is it an error or is it not. And at the end of the day the statements that are going to be able to be made from the statistical sampling that was done and from the reconciliation efforts that were done will not provide results that really would have any meaning to the individual account holder.  They don't have any understanding of whether or not their balance is correctly stated. There's going to be some level of assurance that the transactions are probably correct, but at the end of the day, as far as providing information to the individual account holder on their account, I would contend, it is my opinion, that the information that's being prepared as part of the 2007 Plan would be meaningless.  MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, our cross-examination is completed. I would like to move into evidence  THE COURT: I don't think the cross-examination has begun yet.	01:04:58 5 6 7 8 9 01:05:25 10 11 12 13 14 01:05:42 15 16 17 18 19 01:05:55 20 21 22 23	MR. GINGOLD: Thank you, Your Honor. PPX 4468, which is a document entitled "The Treasury Department's role in the administration of tribal trust funds." It's a Morgan Angel report dated April 16, 2004.  MR. WARSHAWSKY: Your Honor, we object again. This is a draft document. It was prepared for Treasury. It's not probative or relevant to the issues.  MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, all Morgan Angel Ed Angel testified that they routinely prepare their documents in draft until they're otherwise told by the Defendants to produce them.  THE COURT: Do we know what this is? This is a draft. Everybody agree this is a draft?  MR. GINGOLD: No, Your Honor. We do not. They routinely dub their documents draft documents. The testimony is, not only before this court in this current proceeding, but in the trial 1.5, Mr. Angel repeatedly responded to questions of Mr. Harper that they routinely dub all their documents draft documents.  MR. WARSHAWSKY: Your Honor, as you may recall, this
6 7 8 9 01:02:32 10 11 12 13 14 01:02:46 15 16 17 18 19 01:03:07 20 21 22 23 24	THE WITNESS: The fundamental premise is what is the reconciliation, has something been reconciled or not, and is it an error or is it not. And at the end of the day the statements that are going to be able to be made from the statistical sampling that was done and from the reconciliation efforts that were done will not provide results that really would have any meaning to the individual account holder.  They don't have any understanding of whether or not their balance is correctly stated. There's going to be some level of assurance that the transactions are probably correct, but at the end of the day, as far as providing information to the individual account holder on their account, I would contend, it is my opinion, that the information that's being prepared as part of the 2007 Plan would be meaningless.  MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, our cross-examination is completed. I would like to move into evidence  THE COURT: I don't think the cross-examination has begun yet.  (Laughter)	01:04:58 5 6 7 8 9 01:05:25 10 11 12 13 14 01:05:42 15 16 17 18 19 01:05:55 20 21 22 23 24	MR. GINGOLD: Thank you, Your Honor. PPX 4468, which is a document entitled "The Treasury Department's role in the administration of tribal trust funds." It's a Morgan Angel report dated April 16, 2004.  MR. WARSHAWSKY: Your Honor, we object again. This is a draft document. It was prepared for Treasury. It's not probative or relevant to the issues.  MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, all Morgan Angel Ed Angel testified that they routinely prepare their documents in draft until they're otherwise told by the Defendants to produce them.  THE COURT: Do we know what this is? This is a draft. Everybody agree this is a draft?  MR. GINGOLD: No, Your Honor. We do not. They routinely dub their documents draft documents. The testimony is, not only before this court in this current proceeding, but in the trial 1.5, Mr. Angel repeatedly responded to questions of Mr. Harper that they routinely dub all their documents draft documents.  MR. WARSHAWSKY: Your Honor, as you may recall, this document was the subject of a motion that we filed. This was

	1452		1454
1	considered by Treasury and Morgan Angel to be a draft document.	1	Q. And I counted it, it looked like there were about 32
2	With regard to tribal	2	matters in which you've testified?
3	THE COURT: We had Dr. Angel up here and nobody asked	3	A. Correct.
4	him what this was.	4	Q. And of those 32, roughly 20 since you testified in the 2003
01:06:28 5	MR. WARSHAWSKY: It wasn't relevant to our	01:08:59 5	Cobell case; is that correct?
6	presentation of Dr. Angel.	01.08.59	A. That's correct.
7	MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, it was identified in the	7	Q. So, in other words, in the intervening 50 months since you
8	opposition to in the motion to suppress this document, the	8	testified in the Cobell case, you've testified as an expert in a
9	government identified this as	9	different matter about every two and a half months; is that
01:06:40 10		01:09:15 10	correct?
11	THE COURT: It will be part of the record of this case, but it will be assumed to be a draft unless somebody has	11	A. Seems about right.
12	some other testimony establishing to the contrary.	12	Q. And would you identify, putting aside the Cobell matter,
13		13	the matters on those two pages in which you've been admitted or
14	What about 4485, your demonstrative?  MR. GINGOLD: We would like to move all the	14	, -
01:06:58 15		01:09:32 15	accepted as an expert on statistics.  A. The final piece there, Mirage Crossings, is a statistical
16	demonstratives in, Your Honor.	16	
17	THE COURT: All right. I'll receive 4485 as a demonstrative exhibit as well.	17	sampling report as it relates to construction defect cases. The opposing expert on that case is a Ph.D. statistician out of
18		18	•
19	MR. GINGOLD: Thank you, Your Honor.  THE COURT: Thank you.	19	Berkeley, I believe.  Q. And you've been accepted by the Superior Court of Arizona
01:07:12 20	(Plaintiff Exhibit Nos. 4468	01:09:49 20	in that case as a statistician.
21	and 4485 received into	21	A. I'm sorry, I believe you asked me which ones I'd testified
22	evidence.)	22	on. So this is a testimony in deposition only at this stage.
23	CROSS-EXAMINATION	23	Q. All right. Okay. Can you identify any where a court has
24	BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:	24	accepted you to provide opinions as a statistician?
01:07:16 <b>25</b>	Q. Good afternoon, Mr. Duncan.	01:10:05 <b>25</b>	A. If you can zoom out and we go up a little bit.
0	Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR	00.00	Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
	Official Court Reporter		Official Court Reporter
			1455
1	A. Good afternoon, Mr. Warshawsky.	1	<b>Q.</b> I know you brought some papers up there. Do you have a
1 2	,	1 2	<b>Q.</b> I know you brought some papers up there. Do you have a copy of your report up there by chance?
_	Q. Mr. Duncan, you've testified about a wide variety of	_	<ul><li>Q. I know you brought some papers up there. Do you have a copy of your report up there by chance?</li><li>A. I believe I may.</li></ul>
2	,	2	copy of your report up there by chance?
3	<ul> <li>Q. Mr. Duncan, you've testified about a wide variety of subjects this morning and this afternoon. Is that fair to say?</li> <li>A. I think they've all been pretty focused to the issue of the</li> </ul>	3	copy of your report up there by chance?  A. I believe I may.
2 3 4	<b>Q.</b> Mr. Duncan, you've testified about a wide variety of subjects this morning and this afternoon. Is that fair to say?	2 3 4	copy of your report up there by chance?  A. I believe I may.  Q. With the caveat that if there are notes in there I might
2 3 4 01:07:33 5	<ul> <li>Q. Mr. Duncan, you've testified about a wide variety of subjects this morning and this afternoon. Is that fair to say?</li> <li>A. I think they've all been pretty focused to the issue of the 2007 Plan and the sampling associated with it.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 01:10:24 5	copy of your report up there by chance?  A. I believe I may.  Q. With the caveat that if there are notes in there I might want to look at them. If it would assist you to review those.
2 3 4 01:07:33 5 6	<ul> <li>Q. Mr. Duncan, you've testified about a wide variety of subjects this morning and this afternoon. Is that fair to say?</li> <li>A. I think they've all been pretty focused to the issue of the 2007 Plan and the sampling associated with it.</li> <li>Q. I appreciate you saying that. Principally, you're here to</li> </ul>	2 3 4 01:10:24 5 6	copy of your report up there by chance?  A. I believe I may.  Q. With the caveat that if there are notes in there I might want to look at them. If it would assist you to review those.  A. This is a copy of my expert report and, given your caveat,
2 3 4 01:07:33 5 6 7	<ul> <li>Q. Mr. Duncan, you've testified about a wide variety of subjects this morning and this afternoon. Is that fair to say?</li> <li>A. I think they've all been pretty focused to the issue of the 2007 Plan and the sampling associated with it.</li> <li>Q. I appreciate you saying that. Principally, you're here to talk about statistics, right?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 01:10:24 5 6 7	copy of your report up there by chance?  A. I believe I may.  Q. With the caveat that if there are notes in there I might want to look at them. If it would assist you to review those.  A. This is a copy of my expert report and, given your caveat, I will tell you that there are no notes.
2 3 4 01:07:33 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>Q. Mr. Duncan, you've testified about a wide variety of subjects this morning and this afternoon. Is that fair to say?</li> <li>A. I think they've all been pretty focused to the issue of the 2007 Plan and the sampling associated with it.</li> <li>Q. I appreciate you saying that. Principally, you're here to talk about statistics, right?</li> <li>A. Well, statistics and also to address the issue of the DCV,</li> </ul>	2 3 4 01:10:24 5 6 7 8	copy of your report up there by chance?  A. I believe I may.  Q. With the caveat that if there are notes in there I might want to look at them. If it would assist you to review those.  A. This is a copy of my expert report and, given your caveat, I will tell you that there are no notes.  Q. Okay. So feel free to refer to that if that would assist
2 3 4 01:07:33 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q. Mr. Duncan, you've testified about a wide variety of subjects this morning and this afternoon. Is that fair to say?</li> <li>A. I think they've all been pretty focused to the issue of the 2007 Plan and the sampling associated with it.</li> <li>Q. I appreciate you saying that. Principally, you're here to talk about statistics, right?</li> <li>A. Well, statistics and also to address the issue of the DCV, which was provided to me in late September. It was not provided</li> </ul>	2 3 4 01:10:24 5 6 7 8 9	copy of your report up there by chance?  A. I believe I may.  Q. With the caveat that if there are notes in there I might want to look at them. If it would assist you to review those.  A. This is a copy of my expert report and, given your caveat, I will tell you that there are no notes.  Q. Okay. So feel free to refer to that if that would assist you.
2 3 4 01:07:33 5 6 7 8 9 01:07:53 10	<ul> <li>Q. Mr. Duncan, you've testified about a wide variety of subjects this morning and this afternoon. Is that fair to say?</li> <li>A. I think they've all been pretty focused to the issue of the 2007 Plan and the sampling associated with it.</li> <li>Q. I appreciate you saying that. Principally, you're here to talk about statistics, right?</li> <li>A. Well, statistics and also to address the issue of the DCV, which was provided to me in late September. It was not provided before we provided our expert opinions. But my understanding at</li> </ul>	2 3 4 01:10:24 5 6 7 8 9 01:10:38 10	copy of your report up there by chance?  A. I believe I may.  Q. With the caveat that if there are notes in there I might want to look at them. If it would assist you to review those.  A. This is a copy of my expert report and, given your caveat, I will tell you that there are no notes.  Q. Okay. So feel free to refer to that if that would assist you.  A. In the interest of trying to keep my carry-on baggage
2 3 4 01:07:33 5 6 7 8 9 01:07:53 10 11	<ul> <li>Q. Mr. Duncan, you've testified about a wide variety of subjects this morning and this afternoon. Is that fair to say?</li> <li>A. I think they've all been pretty focused to the issue of the 2007 Plan and the sampling associated with it.</li> <li>Q. I appreciate you saying that. Principally, you're here to talk about statistics, right?</li> <li>A. Well, statistics and also to address the issue of the DCV, which was provided to me in late September. It was not provided before we provided our expert opinions. But my understanding at the direction of counsel was that I was to analyze that and that</li> </ul>	2 3 4 01:10:24 5 6 7 8 9 01:10:38 10 11	copy of your report up there by chance?  A. I believe I may.  Q. With the caveat that if there are notes in there I might want to look at them. If it would assist you to review those.  A. This is a copy of my expert report and, given your caveat, I will tell you that there are no notes.  Q. Okay. So feel free to refer to that if that would assist you.  A. In the interest of trying to keep my carry-on baggage light, I have omitted my resume. I'm pretty familiar with it
2 3 4 01:07:33 5 6 7 8 9 01:07:53 10 11	<ul> <li>Q. Mr. Duncan, you've testified about a wide variety of subjects this morning and this afternoon. Is that fair to say?</li> <li>A. I think they've all been pretty focused to the issue of the 2007 Plan and the sampling associated with it.</li> <li>Q. I appreciate you saying that. Principally, you're here to talk about statistics, right?</li> <li>A. Well, statistics and also to address the issue of the DCV, which was provided to me in late September. It was not provided before we provided our expert opinions. But my understanding at the direction of counsel was that I was to analyze that and that the Court would listen to my opinions and my conclusions</li> </ul>	2 3 4 01:10:24 5 6 7 8 9 01:10:38 10 11 12	copy of your report up there by chance?  A. I believe I may.  Q. With the caveat that if there are notes in there I might want to look at them. If it would assist you to review those.  A. This is a copy of my expert report and, given your caveat, I will tell you that there are no notes.  Q. Okay. So feel free to refer to that if that would assist you.  A. In the interest of trying to keep my carry-on baggage light, I have omitted my resume. I'm pretty familiar with it from the standpoint of needing to review it on the plane, so I
2 3 4 01:07:33 5 6 7 8 9 01:07:53 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q. Mr. Duncan, you've testified about a wide variety of subjects this morning and this afternoon. Is that fair to say?</li> <li>A. I think they've all been pretty focused to the issue of the 2007 Plan and the sampling associated with it.</li> <li>Q. I appreciate you saying that. Principally, you're here to talk about statistics, right?</li> <li>A. Well, statistics and also to address the issue of the DCV, which was provided to me in late September. It was not provided before we provided our expert opinions. But my understanding at the direction of counsel was that I was to analyze that and that the Court would listen to my opinions and my conclusions regarding the DCV.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 01:10:24 5 6 7 8 9 01:10:38 10 11 12 13	copy of your report up there by chance?  A. I believe I may.  Q. With the caveat that if there are notes in there I might want to look at them. If it would assist you to review those.  A. This is a copy of my expert report and, given your caveat, I will tell you that there are no notes.  Q. Okay. So feel free to refer to that if that would assist you.  A. In the interest of trying to keep my carry-on baggage light, I have omitted my resume. I'm pretty familiar with it from the standpoint of needing to review it on the plane, so I don't make a copy of it.
2 3 4 01:07:33 5 6 7 8 9 01:07:53 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q. Mr. Duncan, you've testified about a wide variety of subjects this morning and this afternoon. Is that fair to say?</li> <li>A. I think they've all been pretty focused to the issue of the 2007 Plan and the sampling associated with it.</li> <li>Q. I appreciate you saying that. Principally, you're here to talk about statistics, right?</li> <li>A. Well, statistics and also to address the issue of the DCV, which was provided to me in late September. It was not provided before we provided our expert opinions. But my understanding at the direction of counsel was that I was to analyze that and that the Court would listen to my opinions and my conclusions regarding the DCV.</li> <li>Q. And that's why you provided us with Plaintiffs' Exhibit</li> </ul>	2 3 4 01:10:24 5 6 7 8 9 01:10:38 10 11 12 13 14	copy of your report up there by chance?  A. I believe I may.  Q. With the caveat that if there are notes in there I might want to look at them. If it would assist you to review those.  A. This is a copy of my expert report and, given your caveat, I will tell you that there are no notes.  Q. Okay. So feel free to refer to that if that would assist you.  A. In the interest of trying to keep my carry-on baggage light, I have omitted my resume. I'm pretty familiar with it from the standpoint of needing to review it on the plane, so I don't make a copy of it.  Q. My question was, though, whether you had been admitted as a
2 3 4 01:07:33 5 6 7 8 9 01:07:53 10 11 12 13 14 01:08:11 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Q. Mr. Duncan, you've testified about a wide variety of subjects this morning and this afternoon. Is that fair to say?</li> <li>A. I think they've all been pretty focused to the issue of the 2007 Plan and the sampling associated with it.</li> <li>Q. I appreciate you saying that. Principally, you're here to talk about statistics, right?</li> <li>A. Well, statistics and also to address the issue of the DCV, which was provided to me in late September. It was not provided before we provided our expert opinions. But my understanding at the direction of counsel was that I was to analyze that and that the Court would listen to my opinions and my conclusions regarding the DCV.</li> <li>Q. And that's why you provided us with Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4486 last night, correct?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 01:10:24 5 6 7 8 9 01:10:38 10 11 12 13 14 01:10:57 15	A. I believe I may.  Q. With the caveat that if there are notes in there I might want to look at them. If it would assist you to review those.  A. This is a copy of my expert report and, given your caveat, I will tell you that there are no notes.  Q. Okay. So feel free to refer to that if that would assist you.  A. In the interest of trying to keep my carry-on baggage light, I have omitted my resume. I'm pretty familiar with it from the standpoint of needing to review it on the plane, so I don't make a copy of it.  Q. My question was, though, whether you had been admitted as a statistician in any of these matters?
2 3 4 01:07:33 5 6 7 8 9 01:07:53 10 11 12 13 14 01:08:11 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q. Mr. Duncan, you've testified about a wide variety of subjects this morning and this afternoon. Is that fair to say?</li> <li>A. I think they've all been pretty focused to the issue of the 2007 Plan and the sampling associated with it.</li> <li>Q. I appreciate you saying that. Principally, you're here to talk about statistics, right?</li> <li>A. Well, statistics and also to address the issue of the DCV, which was provided to me in late September. It was not provided before we provided our expert opinions. But my understanding at the direction of counsel was that I was to analyze that and that the Court would listen to my opinions and my conclusions regarding the DCV.</li> <li>Q. And that's why you provided us with Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4486 last night, correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 01:10:24 5 6 7 8 9 01:10:38 10 11 12 13 14 01:10:57 15 16 17 18	A. I believe I may.  Q. With the caveat that if there are notes in there I might want to look at them. If it would assist you to review those.  A. This is a copy of my expert report and, given your caveat, I will tell you that there are no notes.  Q. Okay. So feel free to refer to that if that would assist you.  A. In the interest of trying to keep my carry-on baggage light, I have omitted my resume. I'm pretty familiar with it from the standpoint of needing to review it on the plane, so I don't make a copy of it.  Q. My question was, though, whether you had been admitted as a statistician in any of these matters?  A. Well, let me go back and look on the screen here. Go down,
2 3 4 01:07:33 5 6 7 8 9 01:07:53 10 11 12 13 14 01:08:11 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Q. Mr. Duncan, you've testified about a wide variety of subjects this morning and this afternoon. Is that fair to say?</li> <li>A. I think they've all been pretty focused to the issue of the 2007 Plan and the sampling associated with it.</li> <li>Q. I appreciate you saying that. Principally, you're here to talk about statistics, right?</li> <li>A. Well, statistics and also to address the issue of the DCV, which was provided to me in late September. It was not provided before we provided our expert opinions. But my understanding at the direction of counsel was that I was to analyze that and that the Court would listen to my opinions and my conclusions regarding the DCV.</li> <li>Q. And that's why you provided us with Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4486 last night, correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. All right. We'll get to that one. Let's talk about your</li> </ul>	2 3 4 01:10:24 5 6 7 8 9 01:10:38 10 11 12 13 14 01:10:57 15 16 17 18 19	A. I believe I may.  Q. With the caveat that if there are notes in there I might want to look at them. If it would assist you to review those.  A. This is a copy of my expert report and, given your caveat, I will tell you that there are no notes.  Q. Okay. So feel free to refer to that if that would assist you.  A. In the interest of trying to keep my carry-on baggage light, I have omitted my resume. I'm pretty familiar with it from the standpoint of needing to review it on the plane, so I don't make a copy of it.  Q. My question was, though, whether you had been admitted as a statistician in any of these matters?  A. Well, let me go back and look on the screen here. Go down, please. I'd have to go back and look at both what's called
2 3 4 01:07:33 5 6 7 8 9 01:07:53 10 11 12 13 14 01:08:11 15 16 17 18 19 01:08:23 20	<ul> <li>Q. Mr. Duncan, you've testified about a wide variety of subjects this morning and this afternoon. Is that fair to say?</li> <li>A. I think they've all been pretty focused to the issue of the 2007 Plan and the sampling associated with it.</li> <li>Q. I appreciate you saying that. Principally, you're here to talk about statistics, right?</li> <li>A. Well, statistics and also to address the issue of the DCV, which was provided to me in late September. It was not provided before we provided our expert opinions. But my understanding at the direction of counsel was that I was to analyze that and that the Court would listen to my opinions and my conclusions regarding the DCV.</li> <li>Q. And that's why you provided us with Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4486 last night, correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. All right. We'll get to that one. Let's talk about your background in statistics, please. Can you put up Plaintiffs'</li> </ul>	2 3 4 01:10:24 5 6 7 8 9 01:10:38 10 11 12 13 14 01:10:57 15 16 17 18 19 01:11:32 20	A. I believe I may.  Q. With the caveat that if there are notes in there I might want to look at them. If it would assist you to review those.  A. This is a copy of my expert report and, given your caveat, I will tell you that there are no notes.  Q. Okay. So feel free to refer to that if that would assist you.  A. In the interest of trying to keep my carry-on baggage light, I have omitted my resume. I'm pretty familiar with it from the standpoint of needing to review it on the plane, so I don't make a copy of it.  Q. My question was, though, whether you had been admitted as a statistician in any of these matters?  A. Well, let me go back and look on the screen here. Go down, please. I'd have to go back and look at both what's called B&H Manufacturing, Inc., whether or not I was specifically
2 3 4 01:07:33 5 6 7 8 9 01:07:53 10 11 12 13 14 01:08:11 15 16 17 18 19 01:08:23 20 21	<ul> <li>Q. Mr. Duncan, you've testified about a wide variety of subjects this morning and this afternoon. Is that fair to say?</li> <li>A. I think they've all been pretty focused to the issue of the 2007 Plan and the sampling associated with it.</li> <li>Q. I appreciate you saying that. Principally, you're here to talk about statistics, right?</li> <li>A. Well, statistics and also to address the issue of the DCV, which was provided to me in late September. It was not provided before we provided our expert opinions. But my understanding at the direction of counsel was that I was to analyze that and that the Court would listen to my opinions and my conclusions regarding the DCV.</li> <li>Q. And that's why you provided us with Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4486 last night, correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. All right. We'll get to that one. Let's talk about your background in statistics, please. Can you put up Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4284, please? This is your expert report. You remember</li> </ul>	2 3 4 01:10:24 5 6 7 8 9 01:10:38 10 11 12 13 14 01:10:57 15 16 17 18 19 01:11:32 20 21	A. I believe I may.  Q. With the caveat that if there are notes in there I might want to look at them. If it would assist you to review those.  A. This is a copy of my expert report and, given your caveat, I will tell you that there are no notes.  Q. Okay. So feel free to refer to that if that would assist you.  A. In the interest of trying to keep my carry-on baggage light, I have omitted my resume. I'm pretty familiar with it from the standpoint of needing to review it on the plane, so I don't make a copy of it.  Q. My question was, though, whether you had been admitted as a statistician in any of these matters?  A. Well, let me go back and look on the screen here. Go down, please. I'd have to go back and look at both what's called B&H Manufacturing, Inc., whether or not I was specifically tendered as a statistician in that context, but there was quite
2 3 4 01:07:33 5 6 7 8 9 01:07:53 10 11 12 13 14 01:08:11 15 16 17 18 19 01:08:23 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q. Mr. Duncan, you've testified about a wide variety of subjects this morning and this afternoon. Is that fair to say?</li> <li>A. I think they've all been pretty focused to the issue of the 2007 Plan and the sampling associated with it.</li> <li>Q. I appreciate you saying that. Principally, you're here to talk about statistics, right?</li> <li>A. Well, statistics and also to address the issue of the DCV, which was provided to me in late September. It was not provided before we provided our expert opinions. But my understanding at the direction of counsel was that I was to analyze that and that the Court would listen to my opinions and my conclusions regarding the DCV.</li> <li>Q. And that's why you provided us with Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4486 last night, correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. All right. We'll get to that one. Let's talk about your background in statistics, please. Can you put up Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4284, please? This is your expert report. You remember this. And specifically go to pages 43 and 44 of 79.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 01:10:24 5 6 7 8 9 01:10:38 10 11 12 13 14 01:10:57 15 16 17 18 19 01:11:32 20 21 22	A. I believe I may.  Q. With the caveat that if there are notes in there I might want to look at them. If it would assist you to review those.  A. This is a copy of my expert report and, given your caveat, I will tell you that there are no notes.  Q. Okay. So feel free to refer to that if that would assist you.  A. In the interest of trying to keep my carry-on baggage light, I have omitted my resume. I'm pretty familiar with it from the standpoint of needing to review it on the plane, so I don't make a copy of it.  Q. My question was, though, whether you had been admitted as a statistician in any of these matters?  A. Well, let me go back and look on the screen here. Go down, please. I'd have to go back and look at both what's called B&H Manufacturing, Inc., whether or not I was specifically tendered as a statistician in that context, but there was quite a bit of statistical testimony there. And in the Mitsubishi
2 3 4 01:07:33 5 6 7 8 9 01:07:53 10 11 12 13 14 01:08:11 15 16 17 18 19 01:08:23 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. Mr. Duncan, you've testified about a wide variety of subjects this morning and this afternoon. Is that fair to say?</li> <li>A. I think they've all been pretty focused to the issue of the 2007 Plan and the sampling associated with it.</li> <li>Q. I appreciate you saying that. Principally, you're here to talk about statistics, right?</li> <li>A. Well, statistics and also to address the issue of the DCV, which was provided to me in late September. It was not provided before we provided our expert opinions. But my understanding at the direction of counsel was that I was to analyze that and that the Court would listen to my opinions and my conclusions regarding the DCV.</li> <li>Q. And that's why you provided us with Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4486 last night, correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. All right. We'll get to that one. Let's talk about your background in statistics, please. Can you put up Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4284, please? This is your expert report. You remember this. And specifically go to pages 43 and 44 of 79.</li> <li>Mr. Duncan, do you recognize these two pages?</li> </ul>	2 3 4 01:10:24 5 6 7 8 9 01:10:38 10 11 12 13 14 01:10:57 15 16 17 18 19 01:11:32 20 21 22 23	A. I believe I may.  Q. With the caveat that if there are notes in there I might want to look at them. If it would assist you to review those.  A. This is a copy of my expert report and, given your caveat, I will tell you that there are no notes.  Q. Okay. So feel free to refer to that if that would assist you.  A. In the interest of trying to keep my carry-on baggage light, I have omitted my resume. I'm pretty familiar with it from the standpoint of needing to review it on the plane, so I don't make a copy of it.  Q. My question was, though, whether you had been admitted as a statistician in any of these matters?  A. Well, let me go back and look on the screen here. Go down, please. I'd have to go back and look at both what's called B&H Manufacturing, Inc., whether or not I was specifically tendered as a statistician in that context, but there was quite a bit of statistical testimony there. And in the Mitsubishi versus Hughes Electronics case. I'd have to look whether that
2 3 4 01:07:33 5 6 7 8 9 01:07:53 10 11 12 13 14 01:08:11 15 16 17 18 19 01:08:23 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Q. Mr. Duncan, you've testified about a wide variety of subjects this morning and this afternoon. Is that fair to say?</li> <li>A. I think they've all been pretty focused to the issue of the 2007 Plan and the sampling associated with it.</li> <li>Q. I appreciate you saying that. Principally, you're here to talk about statistics, right?</li> <li>A. Well, statistics and also to address the issue of the DCV, which was provided to me in late September. It was not provided before we provided our expert opinions. But my understanding at the direction of counsel was that I was to analyze that and that the Court would listen to my opinions and my conclusions regarding the DCV.</li> <li>Q. And that's why you provided us with Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4486 last night, correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. All right. We'll get to that one. Let's talk about your background in statistics, please. Can you put up Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4284, please? This is your expert report. You remember this. And specifically go to pages 43 and 44 of 79.  Mr. Duncan, do you recognize these two pages?</li> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. And what is set forth on these two pages?</li> <li>A. This is my deposition and testimony history over the last</li> </ul>	2 3 4 01:10:24 5 6 7 8 9 01:10:38 10 11 12 13 14 01:10:57 15 16 17 18 19 01:11:32 20 21 22 23 24	A. I believe I may.  Q. With the caveat that if there are notes in there I might want to look at them. If it would assist you to review those.  A. This is a copy of my expert report and, given your caveat, I will tell you that there are no notes.  Q. Okay. So feel free to refer to that if that would assist you.  A. In the interest of trying to keep my carry-on baggage light, I have omitted my resume. I'm pretty familiar with it from the standpoint of needing to review it on the plane, so I don't make a copy of it.  Q. My question was, though, whether you had been admitted as a statistician in any of these matters?  A. Well, let me go back and look on the screen here. Go down, please. I'd have to go back and look at both what's called B&H Manufacturing, Inc., whether or not I was specifically tendered as a statistician in that context, but there was quite a bit of statistical testimony there. And in the Mitsubishi versus Hughes Electronics case. I'd have to look whether that was specifically I was tendered to the court in that role, but that was a very central part of both of those testimonies.  Q. You don't remember that you were actually admitted as a
2 3 4 01:07:33 5 6 7 8 9 01:07:53 10 11 12 13 14 01:08:11 15 16 17 18 19 01:08:23 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. Mr. Duncan, you've testified about a wide variety of subjects this morning and this afternoon. Is that fair to say?</li> <li>A. I think they've all been pretty focused to the issue of the 2007 Plan and the sampling associated with it.</li> <li>Q. I appreciate you saying that. Principally, you're here to talk about statistics, right?</li> <li>A. Well, statistics and also to address the issue of the DCV, which was provided to me in late September. It was not provided before we provided our expert opinions. But my understanding at the direction of counsel was that I was to analyze that and that the Court would listen to my opinions and my conclusions regarding the DCV.</li> <li>Q. And that's why you provided us with Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4486 last night, correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. All right. We'll get to that one. Let's talk about your background in statistics, please. Can you put up Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4284, please? This is your expert report. You remember this. And specifically go to pages 43 and 44 of 79.  Mr. Duncan, do you recognize these two pages?</li> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. And what is set forth on these two pages?</li> <li>A. This is my deposition and testimony history over the last 10 years, I believe.</li> </ul>	2 3 4 01:10:24 5 6 7 8 9 01:10:38 10 11 12 13 14 01:10:57 15 16 17 18 19 01:11:32 20 21 22 23	A. I believe I may.  Q. With the caveat that if there are notes in there I might want to look at them. If it would assist you to review those.  A. This is a copy of my expert report and, given your caveat, I will tell you that there are no notes.  Q. Okay. So feel free to refer to that if that would assist you.  A. In the interest of trying to keep my carry-on baggage light, I have omitted my resume. I'm pretty familiar with it from the standpoint of needing to review it on the plane, so I don't make a copy of it.  Q. My question was, though, whether you had been admitted as a statistician in any of these matters?  A. Well, let me go back and look on the screen here. Go down, please. I'd have to go back and look at both what's called B&H Manufacturing, Inc., whether or not I was specifically tendered as a statistician in that context, but there was quite a bit of statistical testimony there. And in the Mitsubishi versus Hughes Electronics case. I'd have to look whether that was specifically I was tendered to the court in that role, but that was a very central part of both of those testimonies.  Q. You don't remember that you were actually admitted as a statistician there?
2 3 4 01:07:33 5 6 7 8 9 01:07:53 10 11 12 13 14 01:08:11 15 16 17 18 19 01:08:23 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Q. Mr. Duncan, you've testified about a wide variety of subjects this morning and this afternoon. Is that fair to say?</li> <li>A. I think they've all been pretty focused to the issue of the 2007 Plan and the sampling associated with it.</li> <li>Q. I appreciate you saying that. Principally, you're here to talk about statistics, right?</li> <li>A. Well, statistics and also to address the issue of the DCV, which was provided to me in late September. It was not provided before we provided our expert opinions. But my understanding at the direction of counsel was that I was to analyze that and that the Court would listen to my opinions and my conclusions regarding the DCV.</li> <li>Q. And that's why you provided us with Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4486 last night, correct?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. All right. We'll get to that one. Let's talk about your background in statistics, please. Can you put up Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4284, please? This is your expert report. You remember this. And specifically go to pages 43 and 44 of 79.  Mr. Duncan, do you recognize these two pages?</li> <li>A. I do.</li> <li>Q. And what is set forth on these two pages?</li> <li>A. This is my deposition and testimony history over the last</li> </ul>	2 3 4 01:10:24 5 6 7 8 9 01:10:38 10 11 12 13 14 01:10:57 15 16 17 18 19 01:11:32 20 21 22 23 24	A. I believe I may.  Q. With the caveat that if there are notes in there I might want to look at them. If it would assist you to review those.  A. This is a copy of my expert report and, given your caveat, I will tell you that there are no notes.  Q. Okay. So feel free to refer to that if that would assist you.  A. In the interest of trying to keep my carry-on baggage light, I have omitted my resume. I'm pretty familiar with it from the standpoint of needing to review it on the plane, so I don't make a copy of it.  Q. My question was, though, whether you had been admitted as a statistician in any of these matters?  A. Well, let me go back and look on the screen here. Go down, please. I'd have to go back and look at both what's called B&H Manufacturing, Inc., whether or not I was specifically tendered as a statistician in that context, but there was quite a bit of statistical testimony there. And in the Mitsubishi versus Hughes Electronics case. I'd have to look whether that was specifically I was tendered to the court in that role, but that was a very central part of both of those testimonies.  Q. You don't remember that you were actually admitted as a

	1456		1458
1	A. I don't recall either way.	1	involved in them as well.
2	Q. In your selected experience summary, pages 35 to 40 of your	2	<b>Q.</b> But for example, you haven't authored a publication in a
3	expert report, you listed 16 separate areas of experience.	3	statistics a professional statistics journal.
4	You're familiar with those 16 areas, of course.	4	A. I haven't authored a publication in an economics journal
12:02 <b>5</b>	A. Yes, I am.	01:14:40 <b>5</b>	either. As an economist, working as an expert witness, that is
6	<b>Q.</b> Have you listed being a statistician in any of those 16	6	not something I regularly engage in.
7	areas?	7	Q. That's your profession, by the way, isn't it, being an
8	A. A lot of those areas obviously contain statistical	8	expert witness?
9	analytical work, but I have not listed straight statistical	9	A. I would say that's probably 80 plus percent of the work
12:15 10	analysis is a criteria permeates really all of the analytical	01:14:53 10	that I do.
11	work that I do.	11	Q. Now, one of the things that you disclosed on your CV was
12	Q. You know, I asked you that specifically in the 2003	12	that you're a chartered financial analyst. What's a CFA?
13	hearing, and even after testifying in the 2003 hearing, you	13	A. It's a chartered financial analyst.
14	didn't update your CV to list statistics now as being one of	14	Q. Okay. And for those of us who aren't CFAs, can you tell us
2:32 15	your professional experience areas, correct?	01:15:08 15	what that means?
16	A. I didn't think the criticism was relevant then either.	16	A. It is a CPA is an application of an undergraduate degree
17	Q. The answer to the question, though, is you did not update	17	in accounting. Usually there's an accreditation occurred with
18	your CV to say you're now a statistician.	18	using those skills as an accountant. The CFA would be the
19	A. That's correct. The statistical work that I do as embodied	19	equivalent of that except it's an application of graduate level
2:48 20	in some of these representative cases, I don't feel it necessary	01:15:28 <b>20</b>	skills in economics, finance, statistics, real estate,
21	to clarify for the individuals that I provide my resume to,	21	securities markets and bond markets.
22	beyond the fact that there's a significant component of	22	Q. Principally involved with investment management, investment
23	statistical work, I don't feel required to try and split that	23	banking, financial analysis of stocks, bonds, correct?
24	out as a separate category. It permeates.	24	A. No. That's a big part of it, but it's not principally
13:06 <b>25</b>	Q. Okay. Fair enough. Pages 40 and 41 of your expert report,	01:15:45 <b>25</b>	that. There's also a significant valuation component built into
10.00	Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR	01.10.40	Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
	Official Court Reporter		Official Court Reporter
	1457		1459
1	you describe your teaching experience, and you list four areas	1	that. Valuing closely held businesses, things of that nature.
2	of economics. Do you remember that, sir?	2	Q. It's not a title that one associates with a statistician,
3	A. Yes, I do.	3	right?
4	<b>Q.</b> At the bottom of this page, continues on to the next page.	4	A. Several of my colleagues that are involved and hold the C
3:22 5	And in none of those instances do you even refer to statistics	01:16:00 <b>5</b>	charter are statisticians. They have graduate degrees in
6	as being an area of your teaching, where you teach, correct?	6	statistics and a lot of the analytical work they do as CFAs,
7	A. Again, as part of the micro and macroeconomics, there is a	7	particularly underlying big bond portfolios and stock
8	significant component which is and you asked me previously in	8	portfolios, like pension funds, the work they do day to day is
9	my deposition if there were statistics contained in those	9	as a statistician, but it's applied in the field of finance.
13:38 10	courses, and I informed you there was statistics, sampling,	01:16:18 10	
11		11	<b>Q.</b> You're talking about colleagues that have graduate degrees in statistics, correct?
12	sample design construction. Those are part of those courses	12	A. Correct.
13	that I was teaching.	13	
	Q. But it's not a subject that you actually teach, statistics?	14	
14 13:52 <b>15</b>	A. Separate and apart from economics, I do not. It's part of	01:16:26 15	A. That's correct.
	the statistical analyses and survey work that I've done as an		Q. In fact, on page 42 of your expert report you describe your
16 17	economist.	16	educational background. Master's and a bachelor's degree in
17 10	Q. Okay. And we've got up here on the screen page 41, the	17	economics, and your master's degree you list, what is it, five
18	publications that you've authored. Any of those have to do	18	areas of specialization?
19	strictly speaking with statistics?	19	A. Correct.
4:06 20	A. All of these would in some part have a statistical	01:16:45 20	Q. And none of them are statistics, right?
21	component to them. A lot of the economic blue chip forecast	21	A. No. As we've talked about in my deposition years ago,
22	work that we do is premised upon statistical analysis work that	22	econometrics is specifically the application of statistics and
	I'm doing of trends, macroeconomic and microeconomic trends.	23	statistical concepts in the field of economics. So I would say
23			About this consists which This should be found as a consistent
24	The notion of intellectual property and antitrust litigation. A	24	that it is exactly that. It is statistics, just as economists
24		01:17:03 25	use it.
	The notion of intellectual property and antitrust litigation. A		•

	1460		1462
1	Q. Well, just to cut through it, there are people who use	1	opinion there?
2	statistical analysis in their work, and that's you, right?	2	A. This had to do with the quantification of damages to
3	A. I certainly do.	3	Ms. Power. She was a surgeon and she had actually had her
4	Q. And there are statisticians like Dr. Scheuren and	4	finger severed in a boating accident, and it was an analysis of
:17:16 <b>5</b>	Dr. Hinkins, right?	01:19:55 <b>5</b>	the statistical information on projected future earnings,
6	A. I don't know that you make a distinction. I think they	6	projected for her practice, had to look at Bureau of Labor
7	certainly use statistics in their work as well.	7	Statistics, what likely her profession would be and what
8	Q. You consider yourself to be an equivalent statistician to	8	progress, path she would make going down that road, and quant
9	Dr. Scheuren and Dr. Hinkins?	9	her personal injury loss as a result of that accident.
17:29 10	A. I don't have a Ph.D. in statistics, but from the standpoint	01:20:16 10	<b>Q.</b> And the opinions that you offered in that case actually
11	of using it on a day-to-day basis, I would say that we do very	11	extended to opinions about vocational rehabilitation and life
12	similar things.	12	care issues, right?
13	Q. By the way, I remember at the 2003 hearing, you joined the	13	A. On a very limited basis was I involved in the life care
14	ASA, the American Statistical Association in the middle of the	14	side of that. There were some of those inputs were required
17:44 15	trial. Do you remember that, sir?	01:20:31 15	for quantifying her economic loss as a physician, as a surgeon.
16	A. Correct, I did.	16	Q. In fact, your report was the subject of a motion in <i>limine</i>
17	Q. How's that membership going?	17	because you had offered opinions about vocational rehabilitation
18	A. I've let that membership lapse. It really was not very	18	and life care issues, right?
19	beneficial.	19	A. It certainly was.
17:52 <b>20</b>	Q. So you didn't go to their meeting last year in Salt Lake	01:20:47 <b>20</b>	Q. And why don't you go ahead and pull that up, please. This
21	City?	21	is the first page of the motion. Do you recognize this, sir?
22	A. I did not.	22	A. Yeah. It's been some time since I've seen this, but yes.
23	Q. Now, let's talk a little bit about some of the stuff you	23	Q. Specifically I want to ask you about something. Would you
24	have done as an expert witness. Obviously, today you testified	24	go to page 30 of 69, and continue to the next page. Now, that
:18:09 <b>25</b>	about issues involving statistics. You've testified about a lot	01:21:24 25	looks familiar. Can you do you recognize what that document
	Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR		Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
	Official Court Reporter		Official Court Reporter
1	1461	1	1463
	of other areas beyond just what a statistician does, or even	1	is? And actually, we can go through it if you would like.
2	economists, right? In 2003, for example, you offered opinions	2	There's about 39 pages here. Why don't you flip through a few
3	to Judge Lamberth about the legal application of <u>Daubert</u> in	3	pages, see if Mr. Duncan recognizes it.
4	Kumho Tire, do you remember that?	- 4	A. I do.
18:27 5	A. I provided testimony as it related to whether or not the	01:21:38	Q. What is this?
6	expert work that was done by some of the other experts in the	6	A. This is my expert report in that case.
7	case was properly relied upon other experts, which I opined	7	<b>Q.</b> Would you go to pages 53 to 55 of the document, please.
8	that it did, and the use of geographic information systems, as	8	What's set forth in these three pages?
9	that was something that was typically relied upon by experts,	9	A. These are a listing of, at that time, all cases where I had
:18:45 10	and in my experience I provided an opinion to the court that it	01:22:06 10	been retained as an expert witness, issued an expert report, and
11	was in fact something that was used regularly by experts.	11	then in addition the deposition testimony and trial testimony
12	<b>Q.</b> In fact, it was your opinion, though, for Judge Lamberth	12	columns that we saw previously in my expert report in this case.
13	that the analysis of Mr. Fasold and the folks who worked for	13	<b>Q.</b> And so if you want to flip back, you can see I've put some
14	him, that that analysis satisfied the reliability and relevance	14	red arrows on the left-hand side. These were matters where I
19:05 15	standards of <u>Daubert</u> in <u>Kumho Tire</u> , correct?	01:22:27 15	didn't see a corollary you know, a listing for those cases in
16	A. Correct.	16	your expert report in this case. I gather these are the matters
17	<b>Q.</b> And you're not an attorney, are you?	17	where you didn't testify but where you had rendered an expert
18	A. I'm not.	18	report; is that correct?
19	<b>Q.</b> That may not be a bad thing. But let me ask you, page 43	19	A. Correct. It either settled or otherwise been resolved
19:19 20	of your expert report, you talk about a case that you worked on	01:22:46 <b>20</b>	themselves before
21	called Karron Power versus Delta Houseboat. Can you describe	21	Q. I beg your pardon?
22	that's in the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of	22	A. They had either settled or resolved themselves before I
	California, right?	23	provided expert testimony.
23		24	Q. And if I'm correct, I counted that you provided expert
24	A. Correct.		
24	<ul><li>A. Correct.</li><li>Q. What was your opinion the subject matter for your</li></ul>	01:23:01 25	reports or testified in about 29 matters in the 50 months since

	1464		1466
1	you last testified in this case. Does that sound about right?	1	look familiar, sir, what's up here?
2	A. I think that number is awfully low. This was all the way	2	A. Yes.
3	back in 2005 and we're in 2007 now.	3	Q. What is this?
4	Q. Good point. So it's more than that?	4	A. This is my second expert report, the one that dealt with
01:23:21 5	A. Yeah. I would think it would be significantly more than	01:26:20 5	the fraudulent transfer issue.
6	that.	6	Q. Okay. And this, you stated that you concluded "Defendants'
7	Q. So basically you issue an expert report or testify in a	7	actions did not wear a significant number of the badges of fraud
8	matter about every, what, month, month and a half?	8	to constitute an intentionally fraudulent transfer." Badges of
9	A. Probably average. Maybe a little bit more than that, but	9	fraud, is that a legal concept?
01:23:34 10	yeah.	01:26:37 10	A. It is. It's articulated in the Nevada revised statutes.
11	Q. Why don't you refer to page 44. Let's go back to the	11	Q. And so you were rendering another legal opinion. Is that
12	expert report in this case. So we're back to Plaintiffs'	12	correct?
13	Exhibit 4284. And you're going to have to blow this one up,	13	A. That's not correct. That was specifically a topic of a
14	obviously, but I'm looking at the Carlos Huerta matter. This is	14	motion in limine to have this opinion excluded, which was also
01:24:10 15	a matter in the District Court, Clark County, Nevada. Do you	01:26:52 15	·
16	see that?	16	unsuccessful. The judge deemed that it was appropriate for me
17	A. Yes.	17	to opine to the financial component of those badges of fraud, as
18		18	it related to the claim that it was an intentionally fraudulent
19	· · · · · · / · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	19	transfer. Many of those badges turn on specific issues, like
_	case?		how much net equity does the company still have after the
01:24:20 <b>20 21</b>	A. There were a couple of different opinions in that case.	01:27:12 20 21	transfer, and those were squarely within my skill set as an
	One was quantification of the damage that Mr. Huerta was a		economist and a financial expert.
22	real estate broke r and he claimed that well, he actually	22	<b>Q.</b> You said this was the subject of a motion in <i>limine th</i> at
23	bought the rights to this lawsuit from another person, but he	23	was also not allowed; is that correct?
24	was a real estate broker and he was suing Horizon Ridge Medical	24	A. Correct.
01:24:41 <b>25</b>	Plaza for alleged breach of contract associated with selling a	01:27:23 <b>25</b>	<b>Q.</b> Was the motion in <i>limine in</i> Karron Power ruled on?
	Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR		Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
	Official Court Reporter		Official Court Reporter
	1465		1467
1	property upon which they were going to build a medical office	1 1	
		_	A. I don't recall that specifically, but as far as I'm aware,
2	building.	2	I've never had a motion in limine to exclude my opinion accepted
3	<ul><li>building.</li><li>Q. Well, you also provided opinions about whether a</li></ul>	3	I've never had a motion <i>in limine</i> to exclude my opinion accepted by the court.
2 3 4	<b>building.</b> Q. Well, you also provided opinions about whether a transaction was a fraudulent conveyance, right?	2 3 4	I've never had a motion <i>in limine</i> to exclude my opinion accepted by the court.  Q. Well, you didn't mean to suggest that the Karron Power
2 3 4 01:24:54 5	building.  Q. Well, you also provided opinions about whether a transaction was a fraudulent conveyance, right?  A. Correct. That was the second of the two opinions.	3 4 01:27:38 5	I've never had a motion <i>in limine</i> to exclude my opinion accepted by the court.  Q. Well, you didn't mean to suggest that the Karron Power motion had been denied; is that correct?
2 3 4 01:24:54 5 6	building.  Q. Well, you also provided opinions about whether a transaction was a fraudulent conveyance, right?  A. Correct. That was the second of the two opinions.  Q. Why don't you tell us about that opinion.	3 4 01:27:38 5 6	I've never had a motion <i>in limin</i> e to exclude my opinion accepted by the court.  Q. Well, you didn't mean to suggest that the Karron Power motion had been denied; is that correct?  A. I'm not aware one way or the other. I ultimately I
2 3 4 01:24:54 5 6 7	building.  Q. Well, you also provided opinions about whether a transaction was a fraudulent conveyance, right?  A. Correct. That was the second of the two opinions.  Q. Why don't you tell us about that opinion.  A. This was simply an analysis of whether or not Horizon Ridge	3 4 01:27:38 5 6 7	I've never had a motion in limine to exclude my opinion accepted by the court.  Q. Well, you didn't mean to suggest that the Karron Power motion had been denied; is that correct?  A. I'm not aware one way or the other. I ultimately I believe that case settled. I believe I testified at deposition
2 3 4 01:24:54 5 6 7 8	building.  Q. Well, you also provided opinions about whether a transaction was a fraudulent conveyance, right?  A. Correct. That was the second of the two opinions.  Q. Why don't you tell us about that opinion.  A. This was simply an analysis of whether or not Horizon Ridge Medical Plaza — the owners of Horizon Ridge Medical Plaza made	3 4 01:27:38 5 6 7 8	I've never had a motion in limine to exclude my opinion accepted by the court.  Q. Well, you didn't mean to suggest that the Karron Power motion had been denied; is that correct?  A. I'm not aware one way or the other. I ultimately I believe that case settled. I believe I testified at deposition perhaps, and then the case settled.
2 3 4 01:24:54 5 6 7 8 9	building.  Q. Well, you also provided opinions about whether a transaction was a fraudulent conveyance, right?  A. Correct. That was the second of the two opinions.  Q. Why don't you tell us about that opinion.  A. This was simply an analysis of whether or not Horizon Ridge Medical Plaza — the owners of Horizon Ridge Medical Plaza made a distribution to the owners at one point in time, and there was	3 4 01:27:38 5 6 7 8 9	I've never had a motion in limine to exclude my opinion accepted by the court.  Q. Well, you didn't mean to suggest that the Karron Power motion had been denied; is that correct?  A. I'm not aware one way or the other. I ultimately I believe that case settled. I believe I testified at deposition perhaps, and then the case settled.  Q. Let's go to page 44 of your expert report, please.
2 3 4 01:24:54 5 6 7 8 9 01:25:09 10	building.  Q. Well, you also provided opinions about whether a transaction was a fraudulent conveyance, right?  A. Correct. That was the second of the two opinions.  Q. Why don't you tell us about that opinion.  A. This was simply an analysis of whether or not Horizon Ridge Medical Plaza — the owners of Horizon Ridge Medical Plaza made a distribution to the owners at one point in time, and there was a claim brought in the course of the other litigation, there was	3 4 01:27:38 5 6 7 8 9 01:27:51 10	I've never had a motion in limine to exclude my opinion accepted by the court.  Q. Well, you didn't mean to suggest that the Karron Power motion had been denied; is that correct?  A. I'm not aware one way or the other. I ultimately I believe that case settled. I believe I testified at deposition perhaps, and then the case settled.  Q. Let's go to page 44 of your expert report, please.  THE COURT: Mr. Warshawsky, are you going to bring
2 3 4 01:24:54 5 6 7 8 9 01:25:09 10 11	building.  Q. Well, you also provided opinions about whether a transaction was a fraudulent conveyance, right?  A. Correct. That was the second of the two opinions.  Q. Why don't you tell us about that opinion.  A. This was simply an analysis of whether or not Horizon Ridge Medical Plaza — the owners of Horizon Ridge Medical Plaza made a distribution to the owners at one point in time, and there was a claim brought in the course of the other litigation, there was a claim brought that that transfer in fact made Horizon Ridge	3 4 01:27:38 5 6 7 8 9 01:27:51 10 11	I've never had a motion in limine to exclude my opinion accepted by the court.  Q. Well, you didn't mean to suggest that the Karron Power motion had been denied; is that correct?  A. I'm not aware one way or the other. I ultimately I believe that case settled. I believe I testified at deposition perhaps, and then the case settled.  Q. Let's go to page 44 of your expert report, please.  THE COURT: Mr. Warshawsky, are you going to bring this man up on charges of unauthorized practice of law?
2 3 4 01:24:54 5 6 7 8 9 01:25:09 10 11 12	building.  Q. Well, you also provided opinions about whether a transaction was a fraudulent conveyance, right?  A. Correct. That was the second of the two opinions.  Q. Why don't you tell us about that opinion.  A. This was simply an analysis of whether or not Horizon Ridge Medical Plaza — the owners of Horizon Ridge Medical Plaza made a distribution to the owners at one point in time, and there was a claim brought in the course of the other litigation, there was a claim brought that that transfer in fact made Horizon Ridge Medical Plaza insolvent. So as a follow-up report I was asked	3 4 01:27:38 5 6 7 8 9 01:27:51 10 11	I've never had a motion in limine to exclude my opinion accepted by the court.  Q. Well, you didn't mean to suggest that the Karron Power motion had been denied; is that correct?  A. I'm not aware one way or the other. I ultimately I believe that case settled. I believe I testified at deposition perhaps, and then the case settled.  Q. Let's go to page 44 of your expert report, please.  THE COURT: Mr. Warshawsky, are you going to bring this man up on charges of unauthorized practice of law?  MR. WARSHAWSKY: No, I'm actually going to get to
2 3 4 01:24:54 5 6 7 8 9 01:25:09 10 11 12 13	building.  Q. Well, you also provided opinions about whether a transaction was a fraudulent conveyance, right?  A. Correct. That was the second of the two opinions.  Q. Why don't you tell us about that opinion.  A. This was simply an analysis of whether or not Horizon Ridge Medical Plaza — the owners of Horizon Ridge Medical Plaza made a distribution to the owners at one point in time, and there was a claim brought in the course of the other litigation, there was a claim brought that that transfer in fact made Horizon Ridge Medical Plaza insolvent. So as a follow-up report I was asked to analyze whether in fact that transfer was a fraudulent	3 4 01:27:38 5 6 7 8 9 01:27:51 10 11 12 13	I've never had a motion in limine to exclude my opinion accepted by the court.  Q. Well, you didn't mean to suggest that the Karron Power motion had been denied; is that correct?  A. I'm not aware one way or the other. I ultimately I believe that case settled. I believe I testified at deposition perhaps, and then the case settled.  Q. Let's go to page 44 of your expert report, please.  THE COURT: Mr. Warshawsky, are you going to bring this man up on charges of unauthorized practice of law?  MR. WARSHAWSKY: No, I'm actually going to get to the
2 3 4 01:24:54 5 6 7 8 9 01:25:09 10 11 12 13 14	building.  Q. Well, you also provided opinions about whether a transaction was a fraudulent conveyance, right?  A. Correct. That was the second of the two opinions.  Q. Why don't you tell us about that opinion.  A. This was simply an analysis of whether or not Horizon Ridge Medical Plaza — the owners of Horizon Ridge Medical Plaza made a distribution to the owners at one point in time, and there was a claim brought in the course of the other litigation, there was a claim brought that that transfer in fact made Horizon Ridge Medical Plaza insolvent. So as a follow-up report I was asked to analyze whether in fact that transfer was a fraudulent transfer and whether it resulted in them being insolvent.	3 4 01:27:38 5 6 7 8 9 01:27:51 10 11 12 13	I've never had a motion in limine to exclude my opinion accepted by the court.  Q. Well, you didn't mean to suggest that the Karron Power motion had been denied; is that correct?  A. I'm not aware one way or the other. I ultimately I believe that case settled. I believe I testified at deposition perhaps, and then the case settled.  Q. Let's go to page 44 of your expert report, please.  THE COURT: Mr. Warshawsky, are you going to bring this man up on charges of unauthorized practice of law?  MR. WARSHAWSKY: No, I'm actually going to get to the  THE COURT: Then let's get on with the statistics part
2 3 4 01.24.54 5 6 7 8 9 01.25.09 10 11 12 13 14 01.25.25 15	building.  Q. Well, you also provided opinions about whether a transaction was a fraudulent conveyance, right?  A. Correct. That was the second of the two opinions.  Q. Why don't you tell us about that opinion.  A. This was simply an analysis of whether or not Horizon Ridge Medical Plaza — the owners of Horizon Ridge Medical Plaza made a distribution to the owners at one point in time, and there was a claim brought in the course of the other litigation, there was a claim brought that that transfer in fact made Horizon Ridge Medical Plaza insolvent. So as a follow-up report I was asked to analyze whether in fact that transfer was a fraudulent transfer and whether it resulted in them being insolvent.  Q. And what kind of expertise did you apply in making that	3 4 01:27:38 5 6 7 8 9 01:27:51 10 11 12 13 14 15	I've never had a motion in limine to exclude my opinion accepted by the court.  Q. Well, you didn't mean to suggest that the Karron Power motion had been denied; is that correct?  A. I'm not aware one way or the other. I ultimately I believe that case settled. I believe I testified at deposition perhaps, and then the case settled.  Q. Let's go to page 44 of your expert report, please.  THE COURT: Mr. Warshawsky, are you going to bring this man up on charges of unauthorized practice of law?  MR. WARSHAWSKY: No, I'm actually going to get to the  THE COURT: Then let's get on with the statistics part of this.
2 3 4 01:24:54 5 6 7 8 9 01:25:09 10 11 12 13 14 01:25:25 15 16	building.  Q. Well, you also provided opinions about whether a transaction was a fraudulent conveyance, right?  A. Correct. That was the second of the two opinions.  Q. Why don't you tell us about that opinion.  A. This was simply an analysis of whether or not Horizon Ridge Medical Plaza — the owners of Horizon Ridge Medical Plaza made a distribution to the owners at one point in time, and there was a claim brought in the course of the other litigation, there was a claim brought that that transfer in fact made Horizon Ridge Medical Plaza insolvent. So as a follow-up report I was asked to analyze whether in fact that transfer was a fraudulent transfer and whether it resulted in them being insolvent.  Q. And what kind of expertise did you apply in making that determination?	3 4 01:27:38 5 6 7 8 9 01:27:51 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	I've never had a motion in limine to exclude my opinion accepted by the court.  Q. Well, you didn't mean to suggest that the Karron Power motion had been denied; is that correct?  A. I'm not aware one way or the other. I ultimately I believe that case settled. I believe I testified at deposition perhaps, and then the case settled.  Q. Let's go to page 44 of your expert report, please.  THE COURT: Mr. Warshawsky, are you going to bring this man up on charges of unauthorized practice of law?  MR. WARSHAWSKY: No, I'm actually going to get to the  THE COURT: Then let's get on with the statistics part of this.  MR. WARSHAWSKY: Okay. Very good. I do have to ask
2 3 4 01:24:54 5 6 7 8 9 01:25:09 10 11 12 13 14 01:25:25 15 16 17	building.  Q. Well, you also provided opinions about whether a transaction was a fraudulent conveyance, right?  A. Correct. That was the second of the two opinions.  Q. Why don't you tell us about that opinion.  A. This was simply an analysis of whether or not Horizon Ridge Medical Plaza — the owners of Horizon Ridge Medical Plaza made a distribution to the owners at one point in time, and there was a claim brought in the course of the other litigation, there was a claim brought that that transfer in fact made Horizon Ridge Medical Plaza insolvent. So as a follow-up report I was asked to analyze whether in fact that transfer was a fraudulent transfer and whether it resulted in them being insolvent.  Q. And what kind of expertise did you apply in making that determination?  A. Again, basic economic finance skills, as we were looking at	3 4 01:27:38 5 6 7 8 9 01:27:51 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	I've never had a motion in limine to exclude my opinion accepted by the court.  Q. Well, you didn't mean to suggest that the Karron Power motion had been denied; is that correct?  A. I'm not aware one way or the other. I ultimately I believe that case settled. I believe I testified at deposition perhaps, and then the case settled.  Q. Let's go to page 44 of your expert report, please.  THE COURT: Mr. Warshawsky, are you going to bring this man up on charges of unauthorized practice of law?  MR. WARSHAWSKY: No, I'm actually going to get to the  THE COURT: Then let's get on with the statistics part of this.  MR. WARSHAWSKY: Okay. Very good. I do have to ask  Mr. Duncan about one matter he testified in very briefly,
2 3 4 01.24.54 5 6 7 8 9 01.25.09 10 11 12 13 14 01.25.25 15 16 17 18	building.  Q. Well, you also provided opinions about whether a transaction was a fraudulent conveyance, right?  A. Correct. That was the second of the two opinions.  Q. Why don't you tell us about that opinion.  A. This was simply an analysis of whether or not Horizon Ridge Medical Plaza — the owners of Horizon Ridge Medical Plaza made a distribution to the owners at one point in time, and there was a claim brought in the course of the other litigation, there was a claim brought that that transfer in fact made Horizon Ridge Medical Plaza insolvent. So as a follow-up report I was asked to analyze whether in fact that transfer was a fraudulent transfer and whether it resulted in them being insolvent.  Q. And what kind of expertise did you apply in making that determination?  A. Again, basic economic finance skills, as we were looking at the financial statements. As a chartered financial analyst, I	3 4 01:27:38 5 6 7 8 9 01:27:51 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	I've never had a motion in limine to exclude my opinion accepted by the court.  Q. Well, you didn't mean to suggest that the Karron Power motion had been denied; is that correct?  A. I'm not aware one way or the other. I ultimately I believe that case settled. I believe I testified at deposition perhaps, and then the case settled.  Q. Let's go to page 44 of your expert report, please.  THE COURT: Mr. Warshawsky, are you going to bring this man up on charges of unauthorized practice of law?  MR. WARSHAWSKY: No, I'm actually going to get to the  THE COURT: Then let's get on with the statistics part of this.  MR. WARSHAWSKY: Okay. Very good. I do have to ask  Mr. Duncan about one matter he testified in very briefly, because it does relate to some of the opinions he's offered
2 3 4 01:24:54 5 6 7 8 9 01:25:09 10 11 12 13 14 01:25:25 15 16 17 18 19	building.  Q. Well, you also provided opinions about whether a transaction was a fraudulent conveyance, right?  A. Correct. That was the second of the two opinions.  Q. Why don't you tell us about that opinion.  A. This was simply an analysis of whether or not Horizon Ridge Medical Plaza — the owners of Horizon Ridge Medical Plaza made a distribution to the owners at one point in time, and there was a claim brought in the course of the other litigation, there was a claim brought that that transfer in fact made Horizon Ridge Medical Plaza insolvent. So as a follow-up report I was asked to analyze whether in fact that transfer was a fraudulent transfer and whether it resulted in them being insolvent.  Q. And what kind of expertise did you apply in making that determination?  A. Again, basic economic finance skills, as we were looking at the financial statements. As a chartered financial analyst, I frequently look at financial statements to try and understand —	3 4 01:27:38 5 6 7 8 9 01:27:51 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	I've never had a motion in limine to exclude my opinion accepted by the court.  Q. Well, you didn't mean to suggest that the Karron Power motion had been denied; is that correct?  A. I'm not aware one way or the other. I ultimately I believe that case settled. I believe I testified at deposition perhaps, and then the case settled.  Q. Let's go to page 44 of your expert report, please.  THE COURT: Mr. Warshawsky, are you going to bring this man up on charges of unauthorized practice of law?  MR. WARSHAWSKY: No, I'm actually going to get to the  THE COURT: Then let's get on with the statistics part of this.  MR. WARSHAWSKY: Okay. Very good. I do have to ask  Mr. Duncan about one matter he testified in very briefly, because it does relate to some of the opinions he's offered today.
2 3 4 01:24:54 5 6 7 8 9 01:25:09 10 11 12 13 14 01:25:25 15 16 17 18 19 01:25:39 20	building.  Q. Well, you also provided opinions about whether a transaction was a fraudulent conveyance, right?  A. Correct. That was the second of the two opinions.  Q. Why don't you tell us about that opinion.  A. This was simply an analysis of whether or not Horizon Ridge Medical Plaza — the owners of Horizon Ridge Medical Plaza made a distribution to the owners at one point in time, and there was a claim brought in the course of the other litigation, there was a claim brought that that transfer in fact made Horizon Ridge Medical Plaza insolvent. So as a follow-up report I was asked to analyze whether in fact that transfer was a fraudulent transfer and whether it resulted in them being insolvent.  Q. And what kind of expertise did you apply in making that determination?  A. Again, basic economic finance skills, as we were looking at the financial statements. As a chartered financial analyst, I frequently look at financial statements to try and understand — I've testified in bankruptcy court before on the soundness of	3 4 01:27:38 5 6 7 8 9 01:27:51 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	I've never had a motion in limine to exclude my opinion accepted by the court.  Q. Well, you didn't mean to suggest that the Karron Power motion had been denied; is that correct?  A. I'm not aware one way or the other. I ultimately I believe that case settled. I believe I testified at deposition perhaps, and then the case settled.  Q. Let's go to page 44 of your expert report, please.  THE COURT: Mr. Warshawsky, are you going to bring this man up on charges of unauthorized practice of law?  MR. WARSHAWSKY: No, I'm actually going to get to the  THE COURT: Then let's get on with the statistics part of this.  MR. WARSHAWSKY: Okay. Very good. I do have to ask  Mr. Duncan about one matter he testified in very briefly, because it does relate to some of the opinions he's offered today.  BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:
2 3 4 01:24:54 5 6 7 8 9 01:25:09 10 11 12 13 14 01:25:25 15 16 17 18 19 01:25:39 20 21	building.  Q. Well, you also provided opinions about whether a transaction was a fraudulent conveyance, right?  A. Correct. That was the second of the two opinions.  Q. Why don't you tell us about that opinion.  A. This was simply an analysis of whether or not Horizon Ridge Medical Plaza — the owners of Horizon Ridge Medical Plaza made a distribution to the owners at one point in time, and there was a claim brought in the course of the other litigation, there was a claim brought that that transfer in fact made Horizon Ridge Medical Plaza insolvent. So as a follow-up report I was asked to analyze whether in fact that transfer was a fraudulent transfer and whether it resulted in them being insolvent.  Q. And what kind of expertise did you apply in making that determination?  A. Again, basic economic finance skills, as we were looking at the financial statements. As a chartered financial analyst, I frequently look at financial statements to try and understand —	3 4 01:27:38 5 6 7 8 9 01:27:51 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	I've never had a motion in limine to exclude my opinion accepted by the court.  Q. Well, you didn't mean to suggest that the Karron Power motion had been denied; is that correct?  A. I'm not aware one way or the other. I ultimately I believe that case settled. I believe I testified at deposition perhaps, and then the case settled.  Q. Let's go to page 44 of your expert report, please.  THE COURT: Mr. Warshawsky, are you going to bring this man up on charges of unauthorized practice of law?  MR. WARSHAWSKY: No, I'm actually going to get to the  THE COURT: Then let's get on with the statistics part of this.  MR. WARSHAWSKY: Okay. Very good. I do have to ask  Mr. Duncan about one matter he testified in very briefly, because it does relate to some of the opinions he's offered today.  BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:  Q. The Harbor Breeze matter. That was one before the
2 3 4 01:24:54 5 6 7 8 9 01:25:09 10 11 12 13 14 01:25:25 15 16 17 18 19 01:25:39 20 21 22	building.  Q. Well, you also provided opinions about whether a transaction was a fraudulent conveyance, right?  A. Correct. That was the second of the two opinions.  Q. Why don't you tell us about that opinion.  A. This was simply an analysis of whether or not Horizon Ridge Medical Plaza — the owners of Horizon Ridge Medical Plaza made a distribution to the owners at one point in time, and there was a claim brought in the course of the other litigation, there was a claim brought that that transfer in fact made Horizon Ridge Medical Plaza insolvent. So as a follow-up report I was asked to analyze whether in fact that transfer was a fraudulent transfer and whether it resulted in them being insolvent.  Q. And what kind of expertise did you apply in making that determination?  A. Again, basic economic finance skills, as we were looking at the financial statements. As a chartered financial analyst, I frequently look at financial statements to try and understand — I've testified in bankruptcy court before on the soundness of	3 4 01:27:38 5 6 7 8 9 01:27:51 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	I've never had a motion in limine to exclude my opinion accepted by the court.  Q. Well, you didn't mean to suggest that the Karron Power motion had been denied; is that correct?  A. I'm not aware one way or the other. I ultimately I believe that case settled. I believe I testified at deposition perhaps, and then the case settled.  Q. Let's go to page 44 of your expert report, please.  THE COURT: Mr. Warshawsky, are you going to bring this man up on charges of unauthorized practice of law?  MR. WARSHAWSKY: No, I'm actually going to get to the  THE COURT: Then let's get on with the statistics part of this.  MR. WARSHAWSKY: Okay. Very good. I do have to ask  Mr. Duncan about one matter he testified in very briefly, because it does relate to some of the opinions he's offered today.  BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:  Q. The Harbor Breeze matter. That was one before the California Public Utilities Commission earlier this year?
2 3 4 01:24:54 5 6 7 8 9 01:25:09 10 11 12 13 14 01:25:25 15 16 17 18 19 01:25:39 20 21 22 23	building.  Q. Well, you also provided opinions about whether a transaction was a fraudulent conveyance, right?  A. Correct. That was the second of the two opinions.  Q. Why don't you tell us about that opinion.  A. This was simply an analysis of whether or not Horizon Ridge Medical Plaza — the owners of Horizon Ridge Medical Plaza made a distribution to the owners at one point in time, and there was a claim brought in the course of the other litigation, there was a claim brought that that transfer in fact made Horizon Ridge Medical Plaza insolvent. So as a follow-up report I was asked to analyze whether in fact that transfer was a fraudulent transfer and whether it resulted in them being insolvent.  Q. And what kind of expertise did you apply in making that determination?  A. Again, basic economic finance skills, as we were looking at the financial statements. As a chartered financial analyst, I frequently look at financial statements to try and understand — I've testified in bankruptcy court before on the soundness of plans presented to the bankruptcy judge. So here I specifically	3 4 01:27:38 5 6 7 8 9 01:27:51 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	I've never had a motion in limine to exclude my opinion accepted by the court.  Q. Well, you didn't mean to suggest that the Karron Power motion had been denied; is that correct?  A. I'm not aware one way or the other. I ultimately I believe that case settled. I believe I testified at deposition perhaps, and then the case settled.  Q. Let's go to page 44 of your expert report, please.  THE COURT: Mr. Warshawsky, are you going to bring this man up on charges of unauthorized practice of law?  MR. WARSHAWSKY: No, I'm actually going to get to the  THE COURT: Then let's get on with the statistics part of this.  MR. WARSHAWSKY: Okay. Very good. I do have to ask  Mr. Duncan about one matter he testified in very briefly, because it does relate to some of the opinions he's offered today.  BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:  Q. The Harbor Breeze matter. That was one before the California Public Utilities Commission earlier this year?  A. Correct.
2 3 4 01:24:54 5 6 7 8 9 01:25:09 10 11 12 13 14 01:25:25 15 16 17 18 19 01:25:39 20 21 22 23 24	Duilding.  Q. Well, you also provided opinions about whether a transaction was a fraudulent conveyance, right?  A. Correct. That was the second of the two opinions.  Q. Why don't you tell us about that opinion.  A. This was simply an analysis of whether or not Horizon Ridge Medical Plaza — the owners of Horizon Ridge Medical Plaza made a distribution to the owners at one point in time, and there was a claim brought in the course of the other litigation, there was a claim brought that that transfer in fact made Horizon Ridge Medical Plaza insolvent. So as a follow-up report I was asked to analyze whether in fact that transfer was a fraudulent transfer and whether it resulted in them being insolvent.  Q. And what kind of expertise did you apply in making that determination?  A. Again, basic economic finance skills, as we were looking at the financial statements. As a chartered financial analyst, I frequently look at financial statements to try and understand — I've testified in bankruptcy court before on the soundness of plans presented to the bankruptcy judge. So here I specifically was looking at whether or not that transaction rendered the	3 4 01:27:38 5 6 7 8 9 01:27:51 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	I've never had a motion in limine to exclude my opinion accepted by the court.  Q. Well, you didn't mean to suggest that the Karron Power motion had been denied; is that correct?  A. I'm not aware one way or the other. I ultimately I believe that case settled. I believe I testified at deposition perhaps, and then the case settled.  Q. Let's go to page 44 of your expert report, please.  THE COURT: Mr. Warshawsky, are you going to bring this man up on charges of unauthorized practice of law?  MR. WARSHAWSKY: No, I'm actually going to get to the  THE COURT: Then let's get on with the statistics part of this.  MR. WARSHAWSKY: Okay. Very good. I do have to ask  Mr. Duncan about one matter he testified in very briefly, because it does relate to some of the opinions he's offered today.  BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:  Q. The Harbor Breeze matter. That was one before the California Public Utilities Commission earlier this year?
2 3 4 01:24:54 5 6 7 8 9 01:25:09 10 11 12 13 14 01:25:25 15 16 17 18 19 01:25:39 20 21 22 23	Duilding.  Q. Well, you also provided opinions about whether a transaction was a fraudulent conveyance, right?  A. Correct. That was the second of the two opinions.  Q. Why don't you tell us about that opinion.  A. This was simply an analysis of whether or not Horizon Ridge Medical Plaza the owners of Horizon Ridge Medical Plaza made a distribution to the owners at one point in time, and there was a claim brought in the course of the other litigation, there was a claim brought that that transfer in fact made Horizon Ridge Medical Plaza insolvent. So as a follow-up report I was asked to analyze whether in fact that transfer was a fraudulent transfer and whether it resulted in them being insolvent.  Q. And what kind of expertise did you apply in making that determination?  A. Again, basic economic finance skills, as we were looking at the financial statements. As a chartered financial analyst, I frequently look at financial statements to try and understand I've testified in bankruptcy court before on the soundness of plans presented to the bankruptcy judge. So here I specifically was looking at whether or not that transaction rendered the company insolvent.	3 4 01:27:38 5 6 7 8 9 01:27:51 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	I've never had a motion in limine to exclude my opinion accepted by the court.  Q. Well, you didn't mean to suggest that the Karron Power motion had been denied; is that correct?  A. I'm not aware one way or the other. I ultimately I believe that case settled. I believe I testified at deposition perhaps, and then the case settled.  Q. Let's go to page 44 of your expert report, please.  THE COURT: Mr. Warshawsky, are you going to bring this man up on charges of unauthorized practice of law?  MR. WARSHAWSKY: No, I'm actually going to get to the  THE COURT: Then let's get on with the statistics part of this.  MR. WARSHAWSKY: Okay. Very good. I do have to ask  Mr. Duncan about one matter he testified in very briefly, because it does relate to some of the opinions he's offered today.  BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:  Q. The Harbor Breeze matter. That was one before the California Public Utilities Commission earlier this year?  A. Correct.
2 3 4 01:24:54 5 6 7 8 9 01:25:09 10 11 12 13 14 01:25:25 15 16 17 18 19 01:25:39 20 21 22 23 24	building.  Q. Well, you also provided opinions about whether a transaction was a fraudulent conveyance, right?  A. Correct. That was the second of the two opinions.  Q. Why don't you tell us about that opinion.  A. This was simply an analysis of whether or not Horizon Ridge Medical Plaza — the owners of Horizon Ridge Medical Plaza made a distribution to the owners at one point in time, and there was a claim brought in the course of the other litigation, there was a claim brought that that transfer in fact made Horizon Ridge Medical Plaza insolvent. So as a follow-up report I was asked to analyze whether in fact that transfer was a fraudulent transfer and whether it resulted in them being insolvent.  Q. And what kind of expertise did you apply in making that determination?  A. Again, basic economic finance skills, as we were looking at the financial statements. As a chartered financial analyst, I frequently look at financial statements to try and understand — I've testified in bankruptcy court before on the soundness of plans presented to the bankruptcy judge. So here I specifically was looking at whether or not that transaction rendered the company insolvent.  Q. Can you pull up the expert opinion in that matter, please.	3 4 01:27:38 5 6 7 8 9 01:27:51 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	I've never had a motion in limine to exclude my opinion accepted by the court.  Q. Well, you didn't mean to suggest that the Karron Power motion had been denied; is that correct?  A. I'm not aware one way or the other. I ultimately I believe that case settled. I believe I testified at deposition perhaps, and then the case settled.  Q. Let's go to page 44 of your expert report, please.  THE COURT: Mr. Warshawsky, are you going to bring this man up on charges of unauthorized practice of law?  MR. WARSHAWSKY: No, I'm actually going to get to the  THE COURT: Then let's get on with the statistics part of this.  MR. WARSHAWSKY: Okay. Very good. I do have to ask  Mr. Duncan about one matter he testified in very briefly, because it does relate to some of the opinions he's offered today.  BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:  Q. The Harbor Breeze matter. That was one before the California Public Utilities Commission earlier this year?  A. Correct.  Q. And your opinions were rejected in that, right?
2 3 4 01:24:54 5 6 7 8 9 01:25:09 10 11 12 13 14 01:25:25 15 16 17 18 19 01:25:39 20 21 22 23 24 01:26:03 25	building.  Q. Well, you also provided opinions about whether a transaction was a fraudulent conveyance, right?  A. Correct. That was the second of the two opinions.  Q. Why don't you tell us about that opinion.  A. This was simply an analysis of whether or not Horizon Ridge Medical Plaza — the owners of Horizon Ridge Medical Plaza made a distribution to the owners at one point in time, and there was a claim brought in the course of the other litigation, there was a claim brought that that transfer in fact made Horizon Ridge Medical Plaza insolvent. So as a follow-up report I was asked to analyze whether in fact that transfer was a fraudulent transfer and whether it resulted in them being insolvent.  Q. And what kind of expertise did you apply in making that determination?  A. Again, basic economic finance skills, as we were looking at the financial statements. As a chartered financial analyst, I frequently look at financial statements to try and understand — I've testified in bankruptcy court before on the soundness of plans presented to the bankruptcy judge. So here I specifically was looking at whether or not that transaction rendered the company insolvent.  Q. Can you pull up the expert opinion in that matter, please.  Mr. Duncan, I've had this put up on the screen now. Does this	3 4 01:27:38 5 6 7 8 9 01:27:51 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 01:28:25 25	I've never had a motion in limine to exclude my opinion accepted by the court.  Q. Well, you didn't mean to suggest that the Karron Power motion had been denied; is that correct?  A. I'm not aware one way or the other. I ultimately I believe that case settled. I believe I testified at deposition perhaps, and then the case settled.  Q. Let's go to page 44 of your expert report, please.  THE COURT: Mr. Warshawsky, are you going to bring this man up on charges of unauthorized practice of law?  MR. WARSHAWSKY: No, I'm actually going to get to the  THE COURT: Then let's get on with the statistics part of this.  MR. WARSHAWSKY: Okay. Very good. I do have to ask Mr. Duncan about one matter he testified in very briefly, because it does relate to some of the opinions he's offered today.  BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:  Q. The Harbor Breeze matter. That was one before the California Public Utilities Commission earlier this year?  A. Correct.  Q. And your opinions were rejected in that, right?  A. The application was rejected.  Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR  Official Court Reporter

	1468		1470
1	Q. Well, in fact, didn't the PUC find that your assumptions	1	And then for those six regions where we didn't have any
2	were unrealistic?	2	information, we took an average of the months that we had for
3	A. I testified in front of the Public Utility Commission. I	3	the regions that we did have.
4	did not review their findings at the end of the day. I	4	Q. In other words, if a region didn't have data in December
01:28:39 <b>5</b>	understand that they did allow this other party to come in and	01:31:44 <b>5</b>	1984, you counted it as a missing month, right?
6	begin to provide ferry service back and forth to Catalina	6	A. Correct.
7	Island. But as far as what the basis of the specific	7	Q. And meaning that it didn't have data for the IRMS system,
8	conclusions were, I'm not aware.	8	right?
9	Q. Well, you had made an assumption that, what was it, five	9	A. Correct.
01:28:54 10	trips a day or something like that in your analysis?	01:31:54 10	Q. You assumed, did you not, that every one of those regions
11	A. My analysis went to an estimation of how would the existing	11	converted to IRMS as of October 1984?
12	ferry service very simple notion. The ferry service, they're	12	A. That was the implicit assumption in trying to estimate
13	given a limited monopoly power to operate both during the summer	13	whether or not there were missing months for those regions.
14	and the winter. They make lots of money during the summer.	14	Q. And so if in fact a region converted after October 1984,
01:29:14 15	They don't make much money during the winter because there are	01:32:15 15	your assumption's erroneous, right?
16	not as many people going out to Catalina Island.	16	A. It would potentially change the calculations.
17	And my task was, in meeting with the chamber of commerce	17	Q. If, for example, Alaska converted around February of 1987,
18	and the mayor in the city of Catalina, to try to come up with an	18	you would have counted about, what, two and a half years of
19	estimate of, if someone else was allowed to come in and operate	19	missing data that wasn't really there, right?
01:29:35 <b>20</b>	during the summer sorry, I was trying to speed up for the	01:32:31 <b>20</b>	A. That would be correct.
21	Judge.	21	Q. And you don't know, for example, when the Western Region
22	THE COURT: You can't speed up fast enough for the	22	converted, do you?
23	Judge.	23	A. I believe that information is in the DCV.
24	BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:	24	Q. Well, if I told you between October 1985 and March 1987,
01:29:42 <b>25</b>	Q. I'll take the cue there. Let's go straight to Plaintiffs'	01:32:45 <b>25</b>	does that sound consistent with what you recall?
	Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR		Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
	Official Court Reporter		Official Court Reporter
-			
	1469		1471
1	1469 Exhibit 4486, then. Actually, you all have that. This is	1	A. Roughly.
1 2		1 2	
	Exhibit 4486, then. Actually, you all have that. This is		A. Roughly.
2	Exhibit 4486, then. Actually, you all have that. This is Plaintiff's Exhibit 4486 that you testified about at length	2	<ul><li>A. Roughly.</li><li>Q. Okay. So to the extent your model assumed that the Western</li></ul>
3	Exhibit 4486, then. Actually, you all have that. This is Plaintiff's Exhibit 4486 that you testified about at length today. Let me ask you, first of all, when you prepared when	3	<ul> <li>A. Roughly.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So to the extent your model assumed that the Western</li> <li>Region converted in October 1984, you've overstated the number</li> </ul>
2 3 4	Exhibit 4486, then. Actually, you all have that. This is Plaintiff's Exhibit 4486 that you testified about at length today. Let me ask you, first of all, when you prepared when did you prepare this chart, by the way?	2 3 4	A. Roughly.  Q. Okay. So to the extent your model assumed that the Western Region converted in October 1984, you've overstated the number of months of missing data there as well, right?
2 3 4 01:30:16 5	Exhibit 4486, then. Actually, you all have that. This is Plaintiff's Exhibit 4486 that you testified about at length today. Let me ask you, first of all, when you prepared when did you prepare this chart, by the way?  A. We finished last night.	2 3 4 01:32:58 5	<ul> <li>A. Roughly.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So to the extent your model assumed that the Western Region converted in October 1984, you've overstated the number of months of missing data there as well, right?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 01:30:16 5 6	Exhibit 4486, then. Actually, you all have that. This is Plaintiff's Exhibit 4486 that you testified about at length today. Let me ask you, first of all, when you prepared when did you prepare this chart, by the way?  A. We finished last night.  Q. When did you start working on it?	2 3 4 01:32:58 5 6	<ul> <li>A. Roughly.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So to the extent your model assumed that the Western Region converted in October 1984, you've overstated the number of months of missing data there as well, right?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. And if I told you that the Pacific converted between March</li> </ul>
2 3 4 01:30:16 5 6 7	Exhibit 4486, then. Actually, you all have that. This is Plaintiff's Exhibit 4486 that you testified about at length today. Let me ask you, first of all, when you prepared when did you prepare this chart, by the way?  A. We finished last night.  Q. When did you start working on it?  A. Saturday morning.	2 3 4 01:32:58 5 6 7	<ul> <li>A. Roughly.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So to the extent your model assumed that the Western Region converted in October 1984, you've overstated the number of months of missing data there as well, right?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. And if I told you that the Pacific converted between March of 1986 and November of 1986, again you've overstated the</li> </ul>
2 3 4 01:30:16 5 6 7 8	Exhibit 4486, then. Actually, you all have that. This is Plaintiff's Exhibit 4486 that you testified about at length today. Let me ask you, first of all, when you prepared when did you prepare this chart, by the way?  A. We finished last night.  Q. When did you start working on it?  A. Saturday morning.  Q. And who worked on it? You worked on it, I gather?	2 3 4 01:32:58 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>A. Roughly.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So to the extent your model assumed that the Western Region converted in October 1984, you've overstated the number of months of missing data there as well, right?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. And if I told you that the Pacific converted between March of 1986 and November of 1986, again you've overstated the Pacific.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 01:30:16 5 6 7 8 9	Exhibit 4486, then. Actually, you all have that. This is Plaintiff's Exhibit 4486 that you testified about at length today. Let me ask you, first of all, when you prepared when did you prepare this chart, by the way?  A. We finished last night. Q. When did you start working on it?  A. Saturday morning. Q. And who worked on it? You worked on it, I gather?  A. I did, as well as two of my staff.	2 3 4 01:32:58 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>A. Roughly.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So to the extent your model assumed that the Western Region converted in October 1984, you've overstated the number of months of missing data there as well, right?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. And if I told you that the Pacific converted between March of 1986 and November of 1986, again you've overstated the Pacific.</li> <li>A. There might be 12, 15 months of data there where we don't</li> </ul>
2 3 4 01:30:16 5 6 7 8 9 01:30:27 10	Exhibit 4486, then. Actually, you all have that. This is Plaintiff's Exhibit 4486 that you testified about at length today. Let me ask you, first of all, when you prepared when did you prepare this chart, by the way?  A. We finished last night.  Q. When did you start working on it?  A. Saturday morning.  Q. And who worked on it? You worked on it, I gather?  A. I did, as well as two of my staff.  Q. Now, when you prepared the chart, did you study the entire	2 3 4 01:32:58 5 6 7 8 9 01:33:14 10	<ul> <li>A. Roughly.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So to the extent your model assumed that the Western Region converted in October 1984, you've overstated the number of months of missing data there as well, right?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. And if I told you that the Pacific converted between March of 1986 and November of 1986, again you've overstated the Pacific.</li> <li>A. There might be 12, 15 months of data there where we don't know whether or not they had converted, or if we did find out</li> </ul>
2 3 4 01:30:16 5 6 7 8 9 01:30:27 10 11	Exhibit 4486, then. Actually, you all have that. This is Plaintiff's Exhibit 4486 that you testified about at length today. Let me ask you, first of all, when you prepared when did you prepare this chart, by the way?  A. We finished last night.  Q. When did you start working on it?  A. Saturday morning.  Q. And who worked on it? You worked on it, I gather?  A. I did, as well as two of my staff.  Q. Now, when you prepared the chart, did you study the entire DCV report before reaching your conclusions there?	2 3 4 01:32:58 5 6 7 8 9 01:33:14 10 11	<ul> <li>A. Roughly.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So to the extent your model assumed that the Western Region converted in October 1984, you've overstated the number of months of missing data there as well, right?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. And if I told you that the Pacific converted between March of 1986 and November of 1986, again you've overstated the Pacific.</li> <li>A. There might be 12, 15 months of data there where we don't know whether or not they had converted, or if we did find out they had not yet converted, that would be included in this.</li> </ul>
2 3 4 01:30:16 5 6 7 8 9 01:30:27 10 11	Exhibit 4486, then. Actually, you all have that. This is Plaintiff's Exhibit 4486 that you testified about at length today. Let me ask you, first of all, when you prepared when did you prepare this chart, by the way?  A. We finished last night. Q. When did you start working on it?  A. Saturday morning. Q. And who worked on it? You worked on it, I gather?  A. I did, as well as two of my staff. Q. Now, when you prepared the chart, did you study the entire DCV report before reaching your conclusions there?  A. I read the original DCV and the DCV that was presented	2 3 4 01:32:58 5 6 7 8 9 01:33:14 10 11	<ul> <li>A. Roughly.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So to the extent your model assumed that the Western Region converted in October 1984, you've overstated the number of months of missing data there as well, right?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. And if I told you that the Pacific converted between March of 1986 and November of 1986, again you've overstated the Pacific.</li> <li>A. There might be 12, 15 months of data there where we don't know whether or not they had converted, or if we did find out they had not yet converted, that would be included in this.</li> <li>Q. By the way, back in the Western, if in fact Fort Yuma</li> </ul>
01:30:16 5 6 7 8 9 01:30:27 10 11 12 13	Exhibit 4486, then. Actually, you all have that. This is  Plaintiff's Exhibit 4486 that you testified about at length today. Let me ask you, first of all, when you prepared when did you prepare this chart, by the way?  A. We finished last night.  Q. When did you start working on it?  A. Saturday morning.  Q. And who worked on it? You worked on it, I gather?  A. I did, as well as two of my staff.  Q. Now, when you prepared the chart, did you study the entire DCV report before reaching your conclusions there?  A. I read the original DCV and the DCV that was presented September 30. I understand there were some additional documents	2 3 4 01:32:58 5 6 7 8 9 01:33:14 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>A. Roughly.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So to the extent your model assumed that the Western Region converted in October 1984, you've overstated the number of months of missing data there as well, right?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. And if I told you that the Pacific converted between March of 1986 and November of 1986, again you've overstated the Pacific.</li> <li>A. There might be 12, 15 months of data there where we don't know whether or not they had converted, or if we did find out they had not yet converted, that would be included in this.</li> <li>Q. By the way, back in the Western, if in fact Fort Yuma didn't convert until 1996, you've assumed about 12 years of</li> </ul>
2 3 4 01:30:16 5 6 7 8 9 01:30:27 10 11 12 13 14	Exhibit 4486, then. Actually, you all have that. This is  Plaintiff's Exhibit 4486 that you testified about at length today. Let me ask you, first of all, when you prepared when did you prepare this chart, by the way?  A. We finished last night.  Q. When did you start working on it?  A. Saturday morning.  Q. And who worked on it? You worked on it, I gather?  A. I did, as well as two of my staff.  Q. Now, when you prepared the chart, did you study the entire DCV report before reaching your conclusions there?  A. I read the original DCV and the DCV that was presented  September 30. I understand there were some additional documents that were subsequent to that. I don't know that I've reviewed	2 3 4 01:32:58 5 6 7 8 9 01:33:14 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>A. Roughly.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So to the extent your model assumed that the Western Region converted in October 1984, you've overstated the number of months of missing data there as well, right?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. And if I told you that the Pacific converted between March of 1986 and November of 1986, again you've overstated the Pacific.</li> <li>A. There might be 12, 15 months of data there where we don't know whether or not they had converted, or if we did find out they had not yet converted, that would be included in this.</li> <li>Q. By the way, back in the Western, if in fact Fort Yuma didn't convert until 1996, you've assumed about 12 years of missing data that really wouldn't be there because they weren't</li> </ul>
2 3 4 01:30:16 5 6 7 8 9 01:30:27 10 11 12 13 14 01:30:47 15	Exhibit 4486, then. Actually, you all have that. This is  Plaintiff's Exhibit 4486 that you testified about at length today. Let me ask you, first of all, when you prepared when did you prepare this chart, by the way?  A. We finished last night.  Q. When did you start working on it?  A. Saturday morning.  Q. And who worked on it? You worked on it, I gather?  A. I did, as well as two of my staff.  Q. Now, when you prepared the chart, did you study the entire DCV report before reaching your conclusions there?  A. I read the original DCV and the DCV that was presented September 30. I understand there were some additional documents that were subsequent to that. I don't know that I've reviewed those.	2 3 4 01:32:58 5 6 7 8 9 01:33:14 10 11 12 13 14 01:33:31 15	<ul> <li>A. Roughly.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So to the extent your model assumed that the Western Region converted in October 1984, you've overstated the number of months of missing data there as well, right?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. And if I told you that the Pacific converted between March of 1986 and November of 1986, again you've overstated the Pacific.</li> <li>A. There might be 12, 15 months of data there where we don't know whether or not they had converted, or if we did find out they had not yet converted, that would be included in this.</li> <li>Q. By the way, back in the Western, if in fact Fort Yuma didn't convert until 1996, you've assumed about 12 years of missing data that really wouldn't be there because they weren't part of IRMS until 1996, right?</li> </ul>
01:30:16 5 6 7 8 9 01:30:27 10 11 12 13 14 01:30:47 15 16	Exhibit 4486, then. Actually, you all have that. This is  Plaintiff's Exhibit 4486 that you testified about at length today. Let me ask you, first of all, when you prepared when did you prepare this chart, by the way?  A. We finished last night.  Q. When did you start working on it?  A. Saturday morning.  Q. And who worked on it? You worked on it, I gather?  A. I did, as well as two of my staff.  Q. Now, when you prepared the chart, did you study the entire DCV report before reaching your conclusions there?  A. I read the original DCV and the DCV that was presented September 30. I understand there were some additional documents that were subsequent to that. I don't know that I've reviewed those.  Q. Did you read the Alaska regional report in connection with	2 3 4 01:32:58 5 6 7 8 9 01:33:14 10 11 12 13 14 01:33:31 15 16	<ul> <li>A. Roughly.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So to the extent your model assumed that the Western Region converted in October 1984, you've overstated the number of months of missing data there as well, right?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. And if I told you that the Pacific converted between March of 1986 and November of 1986, again you've overstated the Pacific.</li> <li>A. There might be 12, 15 months of data there where we don't know whether or not they had converted, or if we did find out they had not yet converted, that would be included in this.</li> <li>Q. By the way, back in the Western, if in fact Fort Yuma didn't convert until 1996, you've assumed about 12 years of missing data that really wouldn't be there because they weren't part of IRMS until 1996, right?</li> <li>A. That would potentially be correct.</li> </ul>
01:30:16 5 6 7 8 9 01:30:27 10 11 12 13 14 01:30:47 15 16 17	Exhibit 4486, then. Actually, you all have that. This is  Plaintiff's Exhibit 4486 that you testified about at length today. Let me ask you, first of all, when you prepared when did you prepare this chart, by the way?  A. We finished last night.  Q. When did you start working on it?  A. Saturday morning.  Q. And who worked on it? You worked on it, I gather?  A. I did, as well as two of my staff.  Q. Now, when you prepared the chart, did you study the entire DCV report before reaching your conclusions there?  A. I read the original DCV and the DCV that was presented  September 30. I understand there were some additional documents that were subsequent to that. I don't know that I've reviewed those.  Q. Did you read the Alaska regional report in connection with the DCV?	2 3 4 01:32:58 5 6 7 8 9 01:33:14 10 11 12 13 14 01:33:31 15 16 17	<ul> <li>A. Roughly.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So to the extent your model assumed that the Western Region converted in October 1984, you've overstated the number of months of missing data there as well, right?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. And if I told you that the Pacific converted between March of 1986 and November of 1986, again you've overstated the Pacific.</li> <li>A. There might be 12, 15 months of data there where we don't know whether or not they had converted, or if we did find out they had not yet converted, that would be included in this.</li> <li>Q. By the way, back in the Western, if in fact Fort Yuma didn't convert until 1996, you've assumed about 12 years of missing data that really wouldn't be there because they weren't part of IRMS until 1996, right?</li> <li>A. That would potentially be correct.</li> <li>Q. Potentially be correct. How would it not be correct?</li> </ul>
01:30:16 5 6 7 8 9 01:30:27 10 11 12 13 14 01:30:47 15 16 17 18	Exhibit 4486, then. Actually, you all have that. This is  Plaintiff's Exhibit 4486 that you testified about at length today. Let me ask you, first of all, when you prepared when did you prepare this chart, by the way?  A. We finished last night.  Q. When did you start working on it?  A. Saturday morning.  Q. And who worked on it? You worked on it, I gather?  A. I did, as well as two of my staff.  Q. Now, when you prepared the chart, did you study the entire DCV report before reaching your conclusions there?  A. I read the original DCV and the DCV that was presented  September 30. I understand there were some additional documents that were subsequent to that. I don't know that I've reviewed those.  Q. Did you read the Alaska regional report in connection with the DCV?  A. I believe so.	2 3 4 01:32:58 5 6 7 8 9 01:33:14 10 11 12 13 14 01:33:31 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>A. Roughly.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So to the extent your model assumed that the Western Region converted in October 1984, you've overstated the number of months of missing data there as well, right?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. And if I told you that the Pacific converted between March of 1986 and November of 1986, again you've overstated the Pacific.</li> <li>A. There might be 12, 15 months of data there where we don't know whether or not they had converted, or if we did find out they had not yet converted, that would be included in this.</li> <li>Q. By the way, back in the Western, if in fact Fort Yuma didn't convert until 1996, you've assumed about 12 years of missing data that really wouldn't be there because they weren't part of IRMS until 1996, right?</li> <li>A. That would potentially be correct.</li> <li>Q. Potentially be correct. How would it not be correct?</li> <li>A. You have to go back and look specifically to see whether or</li> </ul>
2 3 4 01:30:16 5 6 7 8 9 01:30:27 10 11 12 13 14 01:30:47 15 16 17 18 19	Exhibit 4486, then. Actually, you all have that. This is Plaintiff's Exhibit 4486 that you testified about at length today. Let me ask you, first of all, when you prepared when did you prepare this chart, by the way?  A. We finished last night. Q. When did you start working on it?  A. Saturday morning. Q. And who worked on it? You worked on it, I gather?  A. I did, as well as two of my staff. Q. Now, when you prepared the chart, did you study the entire DCV report before reaching your conclusions there?  A. I read the original DCV and the DCV that was presented September 30. I understand there were some additional documents that were subsequent to that. I don't know that I've reviewed those. Q. Did you read the Alaska regional report in connection with the DCV?  A. I believe so. Q. Can you pull up DX 153A, 20. Actually, before we do that,	2 3 4 01:32:58 5 6 7 8 9 01:33:14 10 11 12 13 14 01:33:31 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>A. Roughly.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So to the extent your model assumed that the Western Region converted in October 1984, you've overstated the number of months of missing data there as well, right?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. And if I told you that the Pacific converted between March of 1986 and November of 1986, again you've overstated the Pacific.</li> <li>A. There might be 12, 15 months of data there where we don't know whether or not they had converted, or if we did find out they had not yet converted, that would be included in this.</li> <li>Q. By the way, back in the Western, if in fact Fort Yuma didn't convert until 1996, you've assumed about 12 years of missing data that really wouldn't be there because they weren't part of IRMS until 1996, right?</li> <li>A. That would potentially be correct.</li> <li>Q. Potentially be correct. How would it not be correct?</li> <li>A. You have to go back and look specifically to see whether or not any of these regions had been on essentially other previous</li> </ul>
01:30:16 5 6 7 8 9 01:30:27 10 11 12 13 14 01:30:47 15 16 17 18 19 01:31:04 20	Exhibit 4486, then. Actually, you all have that. This is Plaintiff's Exhibit 4486 that you testified about at length today. Let me ask you, first of all, when you prepared when did you prepare this chart, by the way?  A. We finished last night. Q. When did you start working on it?  A. Saturday morning. Q. And who worked on it? You worked on it, I gather?  A. I did, as well as two of my staff. Q. Now, when you prepared the chart, did you study the entire DCV report before reaching your conclusions there?  A. I read the original DCV and the DCV that was presented September 30. I understand there were some additional documents that were subsequent to that. I don't know that I've reviewed those. Q. Did you read the Alaska regional report in connection with the DCV?  A. I believe so. Q. Can you pull up DX 153A, 20. Actually, before we do that, let me ask you, go back to 4486. Sorry, we're kind of making	2 3 4 01:32:58 5 6 7 8 9 01:33:14 10 11 12 13 14 01:33:31 15 16 17 18 19 01:33:44 20	<ul> <li>A. Roughly.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So to the extent your model assumed that the Western Region converted in October 1984, you've overstated the number of months of missing data there as well, right?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. And if I told you that the Pacific converted between March of 1986 and November of 1986, again you've overstated the Pacific.</li> <li>A. There might be 12, 15 months of data there where we don't know whether or not they had converted, or if we did find out they had not yet converted, that would be included in this.</li> <li>Q. By the way, back in the Western, if in fact Fort Yuma didn't convert until 1996, you've assumed about 12 years of missing data that really wouldn't be there because they weren't part of IRMS until 1996, right?</li> <li>A. That would potentially be correct.</li> <li>Q. Potentially be correct. How would it not be correct?</li> <li>A. You have to go back and look specifically to see whether or not any of these regions had been on essentially other previous electronic systems, or if this was their first conversion to</li> </ul>
01:30:16 5 6 7 8 9 01:30:27 10 11 12 13 14 01:30:47 15 16 17 18 19 01:31:04 20 21	Exhibit 4486, then. Actually, you all have that. This is  Plaintiff's Exhibit 4486 that you testified about at length today. Let me ask you, first of all, when you prepared when did you prepare this chart, by the way?  A. We finished last night.  Q. When did you start working on it?  A. Saturday morning.  Q. And who worked on it? You worked on it, I gather?  A. I did, as well as two of my staff.  Q. Now, when you prepared the chart, did you study the entire DCV report before reaching your conclusions there?  A. I read the original DCV and the DCV that was presented  September 30. I understand there were some additional documents that were subsequent to that. I don't know that I've reviewed those.  Q. Did you read the Alaska regional report in connection with the DCV?  A. I believe so.  Q. Can you pull up DX 153A, 20. Actually, before we do that, let me ask you, go back to 4486. Sorry, we're kind of making this up as we go, because we did just get this ourselves.	2 3 4 01:32:58 5 6 7 8 9 01:33:14 10 11 12 13 14 01:33:31 15 16 17 18 19 01:33:44 20 21	<ul> <li>A. Roughly.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So to the extent your model assumed that the Western Region converted in October 1984, you've overstated the number of months of missing data there as well, right?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. And if I told you that the Pacific converted between March of 1986 and November of 1986, again you've overstated the Pacific.</li> <li>A. There might be 12, 15 months of data there where we don't know whether or not they had converted, or if we did find out they had not yet converted, that would be included in this.</li> <li>Q. By the way, back in the Western, if in fact Fort Yuma didn't convert until 1996, you've assumed about 12 years of missing data that really wouldn't be there because they weren't part of IRMS until 1996, right?</li> <li>A. That would potentially be correct.</li> <li>Q. Potentially be correct. How would it not be correct?</li> <li>A. You have to go back and look specifically to see whether or not any of these regions had been on essentially other previous electronic systems, or if this was their first conversion to IRMS. Because I know that many of these actually were on</li> </ul>
2 3 4 01:30:16 5 6 7 8 9 01:30:27 10 11 12 13 14 01:30:47 15 16 17 18 19 01:31:04 20 21 22	Exhibit 4486, then. Actually, you all have that. This is  Plaintiff's Exhibit 4486 that you testified about at length today. Let me ask you, first of all, when you prepared when did you prepare this chart, by the way?  A. We finished last night.  Q. When did you start working on it?  A. Saturday morning.  Q. And who worked on it? You worked on it, I gather?  A. I did, as well as two of my staff.  Q. Now, when you prepared the chart, did you study the entire DCV report before reaching your conclusions there?  A. I read the original DCV and the DCV that was presented September 30. I understand there were some additional documents that were subsequent to that. I don't know that I've reviewed those.  Q. Did you read the Alaska regional report in connection with the DCV?  A. I believe so.  Q. Can you pull up DX 153A, 20. Actually, before we do that, let me ask you, go back to 4486. Sorry, we're kind of making this up as we go, because we did just get this ourselves.  Your missing months, column 7, how did you compile the	2 3 4 01:32:58 5 6 7 8 9 01:33:14 10 11 12 13 14 01:33:31 15 16 17 18 19 01:33:44 20 21 22	<ul> <li>A. Roughly.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So to the extent your model assumed that the Western Region converted in October 1984, you've overstated the number of months of missing data there as well, right?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. And if I told you that the Pacific converted between March of 1986 and November of 1986, again you've overstated the Pacific.</li> <li>A. There might be 12, 15 months of data there where we don't know whether or not they had converted, or if we did find out they had not yet converted, that would be included in this.</li> <li>Q. By the way, back in the Western, if in fact Fort Yuma didn't convert until 1996, you've assumed about 12 years of missing data that really wouldn't be there because they weren't part of IRMS until 1996, right?</li> <li>A. That would potentially be correct.</li> <li>Q. Potentially be correct. How would it not be correct?</li> <li>A. You have to go back and look specifically to see whether or not any of these regions had been on essentially other previous electronic systems, or if this was their first conversion to IRMS. Because I know that many of these actually were on electronic systems well before the time we are talking about the</li> </ul>
01:30:16 5 6 7 8 9 01:30:27 10 11 12 13 14 01:30:47 15 16 17 18 19 01:31:04 20 21 22 23	Exhibit 4486, then. Actually, you all have that. This is  Plaintiff's Exhibit 4486 that you testified about at length today. Let me ask you, first of all, when you prepared when did you prepare this chart, by the way?  A. We finished last night.  Q. When did you start working on it?  A. Saturday morning.  Q. And who worked on it? You worked on it, I gather?  A. I did, as well as two of my staff.  Q. Now, when you prepared the chart, did you study the entire DCV report before reaching your conclusions there?  A. I read the original DCV and the DCV that was presented September 30. I understand there were some additional documents that were subsequent to that. I don't know that I've reviewed those.  Q. Did you read the Alaska regional report in connection with the DCV?  A. I believe so.  Q. Can you pull up DX 153A, 20. Actually, before we do that, let me ask you, go back to 4486. Sorry, we're kind of making this up as we go, because we did just get this ourselves.  Your missing months, column 7, how did you compile the numbers shown under column 7 for the months of missing data?	2 3 4 01:32:58 5 6 7 8 9 01:33:14 10 11 12 13 14 01:33:31 15 16 17 18 19 01:33:44 20 21 22 23	A. Roughly.  Q. Okay. So to the extent your model assumed that the Western Region converted in October 1984, you've overstated the number of months of missing data there as well, right?  A. That's correct.  Q. And if I told you that the Pacific converted between March of 1986 and November of 1986, again you've overstated the Pacific.  A. There might be 12, 15 months of data there where we don't know whether or not they had converted, or if we did find out they had not yet converted, that would be included in this.  Q. By the way, back in the Western, if in fact Fort Yuma didn't convert until 1996, you've assumed about 12 years of missing data that really wouldn't be there because they weren't part of IRMS until 1996, right?  A. That would potentially be correct.  Q. Potentially be correct. How would it not be correct?  A. You have to go back and look specifically to see whether or not any of these regions had been on essentially other previous electronic systems, or if this was their first conversion to IRMS. Because I know that many of these actually were on electronic systems well before the time we are talking about the conversion to IRMS. They were on the systems all the way back
01:30:16 5 6 7 8 9 01:30:27 10 11 12 13 14 01:30:47 15 16 17 18 19 01:31:04 20 21 22 23 24	Exhibit 4486, then. Actually, you all have that. This is Plaintiff's Exhibit 4486 that you testified about at length today. Let me ask you, first of all, when you prepared when did you prepare this chart, by the way?  A. We finished last night.  Q. When did you start working on it?  A. Saturday morning.  Q. And who worked on it? You worked on it, I gather?  A. I did, as well as two of my staff.  Q. Now, when you prepared the chart, did you study the entire DCV report before reaching your conclusions there?  A. I read the original DCV and the DCV that was presented September 30. I understand there were some additional documents that were subsequent to that. I don't know that I've reviewed those.  Q. Did you read the Alaska regional report in connection with the DCV?  A. I believe so.  Q. Can you pull up DX 153A, 20. Actually, before we do that, let me ask you, go back to 4486. Sorry, we're kind of making this up as we go, because we did just get this ourselves.  Your missing months, column 7, how did you compile the numbers shown under column 7 for the months of missing data?  A. There's a footnote there that explains that. We took the	2 3 4 01:32:58 5 6 7 8 9 01:33:14 10 11 12 13 14 01:33:31 15 16 17 18 19 01:33:44 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>A. Roughly.</li> <li>Q. Okay. So to the extent your model assumed that the Western Region converted in October 1984, you've overstated the number of months of missing data there as well, right?</li> <li>A. That's correct.</li> <li>Q. And if I told you that the Pacific converted between March of 1986 and November of 1986, again you've overstated the Pacific.</li> <li>A. There might be 12, 15 months of data there where we don't know whether or not they had converted, or if we did find out they had not yet converted, that would be included in this.</li> <li>Q. By the way, back in the Western, if in fact Fort Yuma didn't convert until 1996, you've assumed about 12 years of missing data that really wouldn't be there because they weren't part of IRMS until 1996, right?</li> <li>A. That would potentially be correct.</li> <li>Q. Potentially be correct. How would it not be correct?</li> <li>A. You have to go back and look specifically to see whether or not any of these regions had been on essentially other previous electronic systems, or if this was their first conversion to IRMS. Because I know that many of these actually were on electronic systems well before the time we are talking about the conversion to IRMS. They were on the systems all the way back to the 1970s. So depending on how that exactly is being</li> </ul>

	1472		1474
1	of months of missing data.	1	A. It may be possible. To the extent that there were months
2	Q. Why don't you pull up Exhibit 153A. Let's go to page 20.	2	where agencies didn't have transactions, that should be
3	Mr. Duncan, did you review this particular page when you were in	3	accounted for in the weighting, of going back and looking over
4	the process of preparing Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4486?	4	all the months we do have information. If there were instances
1:34:24 <b>5</b>	A. I believe that I have reviewed this.	01:37:15 <b>5</b>	where there were not transactions, it would drag down the
6	Q. And would you read the fourth and fifth paragraphs? That's	6	average number of transactions per month or the average dollar
7	actually the paragraph above the highlighting, and the	7	amount per transaction.
8	highlighted paragraph. You can just read that to yourself.	8	Q. But if an agency office, for example, didn't process
9	(Witness reviewing document.)	9	transactions in a month, you treated that as a missing month,
1:34:54 10	A. Okay.	01:37:32 10	right?
11	Q. Did you consider that when you concluded that Alaska had 16	11	A. That's correct. Well, let me back up. It is treated as a
12	months of missing data?	12	missing month with respect to what's reported in the DCV, and
13	A. I don't recall looking at that specifically as we were	13	that was the basis upon which we did the calculation. The
14	trying to pull together what the flip side was of what	14	missing month column.
1:35:06 15	Ms. Herman had testified, how much they had gotten done, I don't	01:37:40 15	Q. Did you read Ms. Herman's testimony in this matter?
16	recall specifically looking at this and trying to calculate how	16	A. Yes, I did.
17	much was left to be done.	17	Q. Do you remember reading the cross-examination when she was
18		18	•
19	Q. Well, if you had looked at that, would that cause you to	19	asked about whether agencies whether there were any agency
19	reconsider your conclusion that there were 16 months of missing	01:37:54 20	offices that regularly processed transactions on a monthly
	data for Alaska?		basis?
21	A. Yeah. It may. Again I'd have to go back and look and see	21	A. I recall there being uncertainty as to whether or not some
22	if Alaska had converted to another electronic system prior to	22	of those missing months were potentially due to them not
23	this.	23	processing transactions, but that that had not yet been resolved
24	Q. Would you pull up page 33 from 153A. Did you look at this	24	definitively.
1:35:37 <b>25</b>	page when you prepared Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4486?	01:38:06 <b>25</b>	<b>Q.</b> Well, if in fact your assumption in this chart is
	Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR		Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
	Official Court Reporter		Official Court Reporter
1	A. I don't recall looking at that specifically.	1	1475 incorrect, that an agency office processed transactions every
2	Q. Do you know what that means, by the way, when it says all	2	month, if that's wrong, your chart again overstates the number
3		3	of missing months data, right?
_	accounts in the region rolled forward?	4	
4	A. This is what we talked about earlier today of their		A. You know, whether or not it had been processed during that
:35:50 5	accounts being out of balance. If one account from the ending		and the second transfer to the second training and the second training at the second traini
6		01:38:22 5	
_	month doesn't match on the opening of the next month, then	6	did get transferred, did it were the transactions that were
7	you've got potentially have an issue that it hasn't been	6 7	did get transferred, did it were the transactions that were processed in the missing month processed in another missing
7 8	you've got potentially have an issue that it hasn't been rolled forward correctly.	6 7 8	did get transferred, did it were the transactions that were processed in the missing month processed in another missing month's transactions, because it may be that they lumped them
7 8 9	you've got potentially have an issue that it hasn't been	6 7 8 9	did get transferred, did it were the transactions that were processed in the missing month processed in another missing
7 8 9 1:36:03	you've got potentially have an issue that it hasn't been rolled forward correctly.	6 7 8 9 01:38:37 10	did get transferred, did it were the transactions that were processed in the missing month processed in another missing month's transactions, because it may be that they lumped them
7 8 9 :36:03 10 11	you've got potentially have an issue that it hasn't been rolled forward correctly.  Q. Was that an issue in this case?	6 7 8 9	did get transferred, did it were the transactions that were processed in the missing month processed in another missing month's transactions, because it may be that they lumped them all the next month. If that month is missing, then the way that
7 8 9 :36:03 10	you've got potentially have an issue that it hasn't been rolled forward correctly.  Q. Was that an issue in this case?  A. It is not. It would surprise me if it was too big an issue	6 7 8 9 01:38:37 10	did get transferred, did it were the transactions that were processed in the missing month processed in another missing month's transactions, because it may be that they lumped them all the next month. If that month is missing, then the way that we've done the calculation, it would average out across both
7 8 9 :36:03 10 11	you've got potentially have an issue that it hasn't been rolled forward correctly.  Q. Was that an issue in this case?  A. It is not. It would surprise me if it was too big an issue in Alaska, because they were fairly recent in coming on to some	6 7 8 9 01:38:37 10 11	did get transferred, did it were the transactions that were processed in the missing month processed in another missing month's transactions, because it may be that they lumped them all the next month. If that month is missing, then the way that we've done the calculation, it would average out across both those months.
7 8 9 :36:03 10 11 12	you've got potentially have an issue that it hasn't been rolled forward correctly.  Q. Was that an issue in this case?  A. It is not. It would surprise me if it was too big an issue in Alaska, because they were fairly recent in coming on to some of these systems.	6 7 8 9 01:38:37 10 11 12	did get transferred, did it were the transactions that were processed in the missing month processed in another missing month's transactions, because it may be that they lumped them all the next month. If that month is missing, then the way that we've done the calculation, it would average out across both those months.  Q. Since you mentioned averaging, you used, what, average
7 8 9 :36:03 10 11 12 13 14	you've got potentially have an issue that it hasn't been rolled forward correctly.  Q. Was that an issue in this case?  A. It is not. It would surprise me if it was too big an issue in Alaska, because they were fairly recent in coming on to some of these systems.  Q. And had you reviewed this particular page, would that alter	6 7 8 9 01:38:37 10 11 12 13	did get transferred, did it were the transactions that were processed in the missing month processed in another missing month's transactions, because it may be that they lumped them all the next month. If that month is missing, then the way that we've done the calculation, it would average out across both those months.  Q. Since you mentioned averaging, you used, what, average dollar per transaction; is that right? I seem to remember that
7 8 9 :36:03 10 11 12 13 14	you've got potentially have an issue that it hasn't been rolled forward correctly.  Q. Was that an issue in this case?  A. It is not. It would surprise me if it was too big an issue in Alaska, because they were fairly recent in coming on to some of these systems.  Q. And had you reviewed this particular page, would that alter your position about 16 months of missing data for Alaska?	6 7 8 9 01:38:37 10 11 12 13 14	did get transferred, did it were the transactions that were processed in the missing month processed in another missing month's transactions, because it may be that they lumped them all the next month. If that month is missing, then the way that we've done the calculation, it would average out across both those months.  Q. Since you mentioned averaging, you used, what, average dollar per transaction; is that right? I seem to remember that somewhere in here. Is that right?
7 8 9 :36:03 10 11 12 13 14	you've got potentially have an issue that it hasn't been rolled forward correctly.  Q. Was that an issue in this case?  A. It is not. It would surprise me if it was too big an issue in Alaska, because they were fairly recent in coming on to some of these systems.  Q. And had you reviewed this particular page, would that alter your position about 16 months of missing data for Alaska?  A. Again, I think as I've already answered, I'd have to go	6 7 8 9 01:38:37 10 11 12 13 14 01:38:54 15	did get transferred, did it were the transactions that were processed in the missing month processed in another missing month's transactions, because it may be that they lumped them all the next month. If that month is missing, then the way that we've done the calculation, it would average out across both those months.  Q. Since you mentioned averaging, you used, what, average dollar per transaction; is that right? I seem to remember that somewhere in here. Is that right?  A. Yes.
7 8 9 :36:03 10 11 12 13 14 :36:22 15	you've got potentially have an issue that it hasn't been rolled forward correctly.  Q. Was that an issue in this case?  A. It is not. It would surprise me if it was too big an issue in Alaska, because they were fairly recent in coming on to some of these systems.  Q. And had you reviewed this particular page, would that alter your position about 16 months of missing data for Alaska?  A. Again, I think as I've already answered, I'd have to go back and look and see, make sure there wasn't another system	6 7 8 9 01:38:37 10 11 12 13 14 01:38:54 15 16	did get transferred, did it were the transactions that were processed in the missing month processed in another missing month's transactions, because it may be that they lumped them all the next month. If that month is missing, then the way that we've done the calculation, it would average out across both those months.  Q. Since you mentioned averaging, you used, what, average dollar per transaction; is that right? I seem to remember that somewhere in here. Is that right?  A. Yes.  Q. Which column was that?
7 8 9 :36:03 10 11 12 13 14 :36:22 15 16	you've got potentially have an issue that it hasn't been rolled forward correctly.  Q. Was that an issue in this case?  A. It is not. It would surprise me if it was too big an issue in Alaska, because they were fairly recent in coming on to some of these systems.  Q. And had you reviewed this particular page, would that alter your position about 16 months of missing data for Alaska?  A. Again, I think as I've already answered, I'd have to go back and look and see, make sure there wasn't another system they had transferred onto prior to this.	6 7 8 9 01:38:37 10 11 12 13 14 01:38:54 15	did get transferred, did it were the transactions that were processed in the missing month processed in another missing month's transactions, because it may be that they lumped them all the next month. If that month is missing, then the way that we've done the calculation, it would average out across both those months.  Q. Since you mentioned averaging, you used, what, average dollar per transaction; is that right? I seem to remember that somewhere in here. Is that right?  A. Yes.  Q. Which column was that?  A. 4. Average throughput per transaction.
7 8 9 :36:03 10 11 12 13 14 :36:22 15 16 17 18 19	you've got potentially have an issue that it hasn't been rolled forward correctly.  Q. Was that an issue in this case?  A. It is not. It would surprise me if it was too big an issue in Alaska, because they were fairly recent in coming on to some of these systems.  Q. And had you reviewed this particular page, would that alter your position about 16 months of missing data for Alaska?  A. Again, I think as I've already answered, I'd have to go back and look and see, make sure there wasn't another system they had transferred onto prior to this.  Q. Let's go back to 4486, please. Another assumption you	6 7 8 9 01:38:37 10 11 12 13 14 01:38:54 15 16 17	did get transferred, did it were the transactions that were processed in the missing month processed in another missing month's transactions, because it may be that they lumped them all the next month. If that month is missing, then the way that we've done the calculation, it would average out across both those months.  Q. Since you mentioned averaging, you used, what, average dollar per transaction; is that right? I seem to remember that somewhere in here. Is that right?  A. Yes.  Q. Which column was that?  A. 4. Average throughput per transaction.  Q. In fact, isn't it true that there were some transactions
7 8 9 :36:03 10 11 12 13 14 :36:22 15 16 17 18 19	you've got potentially have an issue that it hasn't been rolled forward correctly.  Q. Was that an issue in this case?  A. It is not. It would surprise me if it was too big an issue in Alaska, because they were fairly recent in coming on to some of these systems.  Q. And had you reviewed this particular page, would that alter your position about 16 months of missing data for Alaska?  A. Again, I think as I've already answered, I'd have to go back and look and see, make sure there wasn't another system they had transferred onto prior to this.  Q. Let's go back to 4486, please. Another assumption you made, I believe I assume anyway in preparing this chart, is	6 7 8 9 01:38:37 10 11 12 13 14 01:38:54 15 16 17 18 19	did get transferred, did it were the transactions that were processed in the missing month processed in another missing month's transactions, because it may be that they lumped them all the next month. If that month is missing, then the way that we've done the calculation, it would average out across both those months.  Q. Since you mentioned averaging, you used, what, average dollar per transaction; is that right? I seem to remember that somewhere in here. Is that right?  A. Yes.  Q. Which column was that?  A. 4. Average throughput per transaction.  Q. In fact, isn't it true that there were some transactions that were very large in dollar amount?
7 8 9 :36:03 10 11 12 13 14 :36:22 15 16 17 18 19	you've got potentially have an issue that it hasn't been rolled forward correctly.  Q. Was that an issue in this case?  A. It is not. It would surprise me if it was too big an issue in Alaska, because they were fairly recent in coming on to some of these systems.  Q. And had you reviewed this particular page, would that alter your position about 16 months of missing data for Alaska?  A. Again, I think as I've already answered, I'd have to go back and look and see, make sure there wasn't another system they had transferred onto prior to this.  Q. Let's go back to 4486, please. Another assumption you made, I believe I assume anyway in preparing this chart, is that an agency or region would have transactions every single month; is that correct?	6 7 8 9 01:38:37 10 11 12 13 14 01:38:54 15 16 17 18 19 01:39:10 20	did get transferred, did it were the transactions that were processed in the missing month processed in another missing month's transactions, because it may be that they lumped them all the next month. If that month is missing, then the way that we've done the calculation, it would average out across both those months.  Q. Since you mentioned averaging, you used, what, average dollar per transaction; is that right? I seem to remember that somewhere in here. Is that right?  A. Yes.  Q. Which column was that?  A. 4. Average throughput per transaction.  Q. In fact, isn't it true that there were some transactions that were very large in dollar amount?  A. Correct.  Q. And many, many small transactions?
7 8 9 :36:03 10 11 12 13 14 :36:22 15 16 17 18 19 :36:44 20 21 22	you've got potentially have an issue that it hasn't been rolled forward correctly.  Q. Was that an issue in this case?  A. It is not. It would surprise me if it was too big an issue in Alaska, because they were fairly recent in coming on to some of these systems.  Q. And had you reviewed this particular page, would that alter your position about 16 months of missing data for Alaska?  A. Again, I think as I've already answered, I'd have to go back and look and see, make sure there wasn't another system they had transferred onto prior to this.  Q. Let's go back to 4486, please. Another assumption you made, I believe I assume anyway in preparing this chart, is that an agency or region would have transactions every single month; is that correct?  A. Correct.	6 7 8 9 01:38:37 10 11 12 13 14 01:38:54 15 16 17 18 19 01:39:10 20 21 22	did get transferred, did it were the transactions that were processed in the missing month processed in another missing month's transactions, because it may be that they lumped them all the next month. If that month is missing, then the way that we've done the calculation, it would average out across both those months.  Q. Since you mentioned averaging, you used, what, average dollar per transaction; is that right? I seem to remember that somewhere in here. Is that right?  A. Yes.  Q. Which column was that?  A. 4. Average throughput per transaction.  Q. In fact, isn't it true that there were some transactions that were very large in dollar amount?  A. Correct.  Q. And many, many small transactions?  A. Correct.
7 8 9 1:36:03 10 11 12 13 14 15:36:22 15 16 17 18 19 21 22 23	you've got potentially have an issue that it hasn't been rolled forward correctly.  Q. Was that an issue in this case?  A. It is not. It would surprise me if it was too big an issue in Alaska, because they were fairly recent in coming on to some of these systems.  Q. And had you reviewed this particular page, would that alter your position about 16 months of missing data for Alaska?  A. Again, I think as I've already answered, I'd have to go back and look and see, make sure there wasn't another system they had transferred onto prior to this.  Q. Let's go back to 4486, please. Another assumption you made, I believe I assume anyway in preparing this chart, is that an agency or region would have transactions every single month; is that correct?  A. Correct.  Q. And in fact, do you know if that's the case? Were there in	6 7 8 9 01:38:37 10 11 12 13 14 01:38:54 15 16 17 18 19 01:39:10 20 21 22 23	did get transferred, did it were the transactions that were processed in the missing month processed in another missing month's transactions, because it may be that they lumped them all the next month. If that month is missing, then the way that we've done the calculation, it would average out across both those months.  Q. Since you mentioned averaging, you used, what, average dollar per transaction; is that right? I seem to remember that somewhere in here. Is that right?  A. Yes.  Q. Which column was that?  A. 4. Average throughput per transaction.  Q. In fact, isn't it true that there were some transactions that were very large in dollar amount?  A. Correct.  Q. And many, many small transactions?  A. Correct.  Q. Doesn't it overstate the impact in your chart to use an
7 8 9 11:36:03 10 11 12 13 14 1:36:22 15 16 17 18 19 1:36:44 20 21 22 23 24	you've got potentially have an issue that it hasn't been rolled forward correctly.  Q. Was that an issue in this case?  A. It is not. It would surprise me if it was too big an issue in Alaska, because they were fairly recent in coming on to some of these systems.  Q. And had you reviewed this particular page, would that alter your position about 16 months of missing data for Alaska?  A. Again, I think as I've already answered, I'd have to go back and look and see, make sure there wasn't another system they had transferred onto prior to this.  Q. Let's go back to 4486, please. Another assumption you made, I believe I assume anyway in preparing this chart, is that an agency or region would have transactions every single month; is that correct?  A. Correct.  Q. And in fact, do you know if that's the case? Were there in fact some agencies, agency offices that had months where they	6 7 8 9 01:38:37 10 11 12 13 14 01:38:54 15 16 17 18 19 01:39:10 20 21 22 23 24	processed in the missing month processed in another missing month's transactions, because it may be that they lumped them all the next month. If that month is missing, then the way that we've done the calculation, it would average out across both those months.  Q. Since you mentioned averaging, you used, what, average dollar per transaction; is that right? I seem to remember that somewhere in here. Is that right?  A. Yes.  Q. Which column was that?  A. 4. Average throughput per transaction.  Q. In fact, isn't it true that there were some transactions that were very large in dollar amount?  A. Correct.  Q. And many, many small transactions?  A. Correct.  Q. Doesn't it overstate the impact in your chart to use an average for the transactions?
7 8 9 11:36:03 10 11 12 13 14 11:36:22 15 16 17 18 19 11:36:44 20 21 22 23	you've got potentially have an issue that it hasn't been rolled forward correctly.  Q. Was that an issue in this case?  A. It is not. It would surprise me if it was too big an issue in Alaska, because they were fairly recent in coming on to some of these systems.  Q. And had you reviewed this particular page, would that alter your position about 16 months of missing data for Alaska?  A. Again, I think as I've already answered, I'd have to go back and look and see, make sure there wasn't another system they had transferred onto prior to this.  Q. Let's go back to 4486, please. Another assumption you made, I believe I assume anyway in preparing this chart, is that an agency or region would have transactions every single month; is that correct?  A. Correct.  Q. And in fact, do you know if that's the case? Were there in	6 7 8 9 01:38:37 10 11 12 13 14 01:38:54 15 16 17 18 19 01:39:10 20 21 22 23	did get transferred, did it were the transactions that were processed in the missing month processed in another missing month's transactions, because it may be that they lumped them all the next month. If that month is missing, then the way that we've done the calculation, it would average out across both those months.  Q. Since you mentioned averaging, you used, what, average dollar per transaction; is that right? I seem to remember that somewhere in here. Is that right?  A. Yes.  Q. Which column was that?  A. 4. Average throughput per transaction.  Q. In fact, isn't it true that there were some transactions that were very large in dollar amount?  A. Correct.  Q. And many, many small transactions?  A. Correct.  Q. Doesn't it overstate the impact in your chart to use an

	1476		1478
1	to do the other calculation, but with the information we had, it	1	This witness has testified in open court about his opinions
2	was limited to being able to do this analysis. So it depends on	2	about irrelevant sample design, sample selection problem, et
3	how the weighting works out between the number of transactions.	3	cetera. He hasn't said anything until you raised the subject
4	It's not part of the DCV that we can tell.	4	about confusing and misleading the layperson, and I'm not going
:39:39 <b>5</b>	Q. And one other thing, going back to the 1980s, do you know	01:42:43 <b>5</b>	to take that into account. You can cross-examine it if you'd
6	were there in fact what was the practice in terms of do	6	like, but what's written in his report means nothing to me.
7	you remember whether there was a practice in terms of paying	7	MR. WARSHAWSKY: I would like to use, Your Honor, with
8	interest every six months or whether interest was posted on a	8	your indulgence, I would like to use the executive summary in
9	monthly basis?	9	his report as a basis for talking, organizing the opinions that
39:58 10	A. I may have known that at one point in this case, but I	01:43:02 10	he talked about today.
11	don't recall now.	11	THE COURT: You can organize it any way you want to.
12	Q. So if in fact early on, for purposes of your analysis,	12	I just want to give you a heads-up that I don't care about
13	interest was posted every six months instead of every month,	13	what's written in this report unless he's also testified to it
14	again your chart would overstate the impact of missing	14	in open court.
40:13 15	transactions, right?	01:43:15 15	MR. WARSHAWSKY: Very good, Your Honor.
16	A. It may potentially. You'd have to go back and look and see	16	BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:
17	how they actually broke out between the months. Again, data we	17	Q. You testified guite a bit about sampling, but in fact, I
18	don't have access to.	18	believe you actually frequently stated that you lack the
19	Q. Okay. All right. In your report, let's go to 4284,	19	information necessary to evaluate the sampling plan that
40:32 <b>20</b>	please. Now, you used an expression numerous times in this	01:43:32 <b>20</b>	Interior's put out, right?
21	report, you talked about Interior's plan we can look at page	21	A. I think I've testified that there's information about the
22	5, for example. It's in the first paragraph, the heading right	22	reconciliation activity that was clearly lacking. The
23	at the top. Just do the paragraph.	23	information that we had I thought formed a reasonable basis fo
24	See right there in the first sentence you talked about	24	me reaching the conclusions about the sampling plan,
40:56 <b>25</b>	used this expression about whether something, quote, "would	01:43:47 25	particularly then as I was able to read the information provided
40:56	Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR	01:43:47	Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
	Official Court Reporter		Official Court Reporter
	1477		1479
1	likely confuse and mislead the layperson."	1	in the rebuttal reports. It was very clear to me what the
2	A. Correct.	2	intentions and what the design was originally constructed to do
3	Q. What kind of what field were you using or what expertise	3	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
	Time time of time trote you doing of time expertise		<b>Q.</b> Okay. Let's look at the first bullet point here under the
4	were you using in reaching those conclusions? Is that a	4	executive summary. You talked about missing and destroyed data,
_	., ., ., ., ., ., ., ., ., ., ., ., ., .		,
_	were you using in reaching those conclusions? Is that a	4	executive summary. You talked about missing and destroyed data,
41:13 5	were you using in reaching those conclusions? Is that a statistical judgment?	4 01:44:06 <b>5</b>	executive summary. You talked about missing and destroyed data, drawing from a target population not being possible. You
41:13 5	were you using in reaching those conclusions? Is that a statistical judgment?  A. It is. As a statistician and certainly as an expert	01:44:06 <b>5 6</b>	executive summary. You talked about missing and destroyed data, drawing from a target population not being possible. You testified at length about that today, right, sir?
41:13 <b>5 6 7</b>	were you using in reaching those conclusions? Is that a statistical judgment?  A. It is. As a statistician and certainly as an expert witness, I think when you're providing testimony to a jury or to	01:44:06 <b>5 6 7</b>	executive summary. You talked about missing and destroyed data, drawing from a target population not being possible. You testified at length about that today, right, sir?  A. Correct.
5 6 7 8 9	were you using in reaching those conclusions? Is that a statistical judgment?  A. It is. As a statistician and certainly as an expert witness, I think when you're providing testimony to a jury or to the judge you need to take into account who that audience is.  And when you provide information, you need to present it in such	01:44:06 5 6 7 8	executive summary. You talked about missing and destroyed data, drawing from a target population not being possible. You testified at length about that today, right, sir?  A. Correct.  Q. And isn't it true that the mere fact that some data is missing or has been destroyed, that doesn't mean that there are
5 6 7 8 9	were you using in reaching those conclusions? Is that a statistical judgment?  A. It is. As a statistician and certainly as an expert witness, I think when you're providing testimony to a jury or to the judge you need to take into account who that audience is. And when you provide information, you need to present it in such a way that it wouldn't mislead that consumer of the information.	01:44:06	executive summary. You talked about missing and destroyed data, drawing from a target population not being possible. You testified at length about that today, right, sir?  A. Correct.  Q. And isn't it true that the mere fact that some data is missing or has been destroyed, that doesn't mean that there are no other copies of that information available, right?
41:13 <b>5</b> 6 7 8 9 441:26 <b>10</b>	were you using in reaching those conclusions? Is that a statistical judgment?  A. It is. As a statistician and certainly as an expert witness, I think when you're providing testimony to a jury or to the judge you need to take into account who that audience is.  And when you provide information, you need to present it in such a way that it wouldn't mislead that consumer of the information.  Q. Okay. And are there any standards in statistics you apply	01:44:06	executive summary. You talked about missing and destroyed data, drawing from a target population not being possible. You testified at length about that today, right, sir?  A. Correct.  Q. And isn't it true that the mere fact that some data is missing or has been destroyed, that doesn't mean that there are no other copies of that information available, right?  A. Doesn't necessarily mean that there are not other copies.
41:13 5 6 7 8 9 41:26 10 11	were you using in reaching those conclusions? Is that a statistical judgment?  A. It is. As a statistician and certainly as an expert witness, I think when you're providing testimony to a jury or to the judge you need to take into account who that audience is. And when you provide information, you need to present it in such a way that it wouldn't mislead that consumer of the information.  Q. Okay. And are there any standards in statistics you apply in reaching that conclusion?	01:44:06	executive summary. You talked about missing and destroyed data, drawing from a target population not being possible. You testified at length about that today, right, sir?  A. Correct.  Q. And isn't it true that the mere fact that some data is missing or has been destroyed, that doesn't mean that there are no other copies of that information available, right?  A. Doesn't necessarily mean that there are not other copies.  It doesn't mean that there are. It simply means there have been
441:13 5 6 7 8 9 11 11 12 13	were you using in reaching those conclusions? Is that a statistical judgment?  A. It is. As a statistician and certainly as an expert witness, I think when you're providing testimony to a jury or to the judge you need to take into account who that audience is. And when you provide information, you need to present it in such a way that it wouldn't mislead that consumer of the information.  Q. Okay. And are there any standards in statistics you apply in reaching that conclusion?  A. No, but based on years of experience, you can have some	01:44:06	executive summary. You talked about missing and destroyed data, drawing from a target population not being possible. You testified at length about that today, right, sir?  A. Correct.  Q. And isn't it true that the mere fact that some data is missing or has been destroyed, that doesn't mean that there are no other copies of that information available, right?  A. Doesn't necessarily mean that there are not other copies. It doesn't mean that there are. It simply means there have been data that are destroyed or missing.
41:13 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	were you using in reaching those conclusions? Is that a statistical judgment?  A. It is. As a statistician and certainly as an expert witness, I think when you're providing testimony to a jury or to the judge you need to take into account who that audience is.  And when you provide information, you need to present it in such a way that it wouldn't mislead that consumer of the information.  Q. Okay. And are there any standards in statistics you apply in reaching that conclusion?  A. No, but based on years of experience, you can have some idea as to who your audience is and whether or not they will	01:44:06	executive summary. You talked about missing and destroyed data, drawing from a target population not being possible. You testified at length about that today, right, sir?  A. Correct.  Q. And isn't it true that the mere fact that some data is missing or has been destroyed, that doesn't mean that there are no other copies of that information available, right?  A. Doesn't necessarily mean that there are not other copies. It doesn't mean that there are. It simply means there have been data that are destroyed or missing.  Q. Have you reviewed any of the testimony in this case
41:13 5 6 7 8 9 141:26 10 11 12 13 14 141:46 15	were you using in reaching those conclusions? Is that a statistical judgment?  A. It is. As a statistician and certainly as an expert witness, I think when you're providing testimony to a jury or to the judge you need to take into account who that audience is. And when you provide information, you need to present it in such a way that it wouldn't mislead that consumer of the information.  Q. Okay. And are there any standards in statistics you apply in reaching that conclusion?  A. No, but based on years of experience, you can have some idea as to who your audience is and whether or not they will correctly interpret and use the information you're providing, or	01:44:06 5 6 7 8 9 01:44:22 10 11 12 13 14 01:44:38 15	executive summary. You talked about missing and destroyed data, drawing from a target population not being possible. You testified at length about that today, right, sir?  A. Correct.  Q. And isn't it true that the mere fact that some data is missing or has been destroyed, that doesn't mean that there are no other copies of that information available, right?  A. Doesn't necessarily mean that there are not other copies. It doesn't mean that there are. It simply means there have bee data that are destroyed or missing.  Q. Have you reviewed any of the testimony in this case discussing the redundancy of information within Interior's
41:13 5 6 7 8 9 11 12 13 14 15 16 15 16	were you using in reaching those conclusions? Is that a statistical judgment?  A. It is. As a statistician and certainly as an expert witness, I think when you're providing testimony to a jury or to the judge you need to take into account who that audience is. And when you provide information, you need to present it in such a way that it wouldn't mislead that consumer of the information.  Q. Okay. And are there any standards in statistics you apply in reaching that conclusion?  A. No, but based on years of experience, you can have some idea as to who your audience is and whether or not they will correctly interpret and use the information you're providing, or whether you need to be more clear and not use statistical	01:44:06	executive summary. You talked about missing and destroyed data, drawing from a target population not being possible. You testified at length about that today, right, sir?  A. Correct.  Q. And isn't it true that the mere fact that some data is missing or has been destroyed, that doesn't mean that there are no other copies of that information available, right?  A. Doesn't necessarily mean that there are not other copies. It doesn't mean that there are. It simply means there have bee data that are destroyed or missing.  Q. Have you reviewed any of the testimony in this case discussing the redundancy of information within Interior's system?
41:13 5 6 7 8 9 41:26 10 11 12 13 14 41:46 15 16 17	were you using in reaching those conclusions? Is that a statistical judgment?  A. It is. As a statistician and certainly as an expert witness, I think when you're providing testimony to a jury or to the judge you need to take into account who that audience is.  And when you provide information, you need to present it in such a way that it wouldn't mislead that consumer of the information.  Q. Okay. And are there any standards in statistics you apply in reaching that conclusion?  A. No, but based on years of experience, you can have some idea as to who your audience is and whether or not they will correctly interpret and use the information you're providing, or whether you need to be more clear and not use statistical jargon, but you need to be clear and make sure that it doesn't	01:44:06	executive summary. You talked about missing and destroyed data, drawing from a target population not being possible. You testified at length about that today, right, sir?  A. Correct.  Q. And isn't it true that the mere fact that some data is missing or has been destroyed, that doesn't mean that there are no other copies of that information available, right?  A. Doesn't necessarily mean that there are not other copies. It doesn't mean that there are. It simply means there have been data that are destroyed or missing.  Q. Have you reviewed any of the testimony in this case discussing the redundancy of information within Interior's system?  A. I recall that being in your opening comments. I don't
41:13 5 6 7 8 9 41:26 10 11 12 13 14 41:46 15 16 17 18	were you using in reaching those conclusions? Is that a statistical judgment?  A. It is. As a statistician and certainly as an expert witness, I think when you're providing testimony to a jury or to the judge you need to take into account who that audience is.  And when you provide information, you need to present it in such a way that it wouldn't mislead that consumer of the information.  Q. Okay. And are there any standards in statistics you apply in reaching that conclusion?  A. No, but based on years of experience, you can have some idea as to who your audience is and whether or not they will correctly interpret and use the information you're providing, or whether you need to be more clear and not use statistical jargon, but you need to be clear and make sure that it doesn't potentially mislead someone.	01:44:06	executive summary. You talked about missing and destroyed data, drawing from a target population not being possible. You testified at length about that today, right, sir?  A. Correct.  Q. And isn't it true that the mere fact that some data is missing or has been destroyed, that doesn't mean that there are no other copies of that information available, right?  A. Doesn't necessarily mean that there are not other copies. It doesn't mean that there are. It simply means there have bee data that are destroyed or missing.  Q. Have you reviewed any of the testimony in this case discussing the redundancy of information within Interior's system?  A. I recall that being in your opening comments. I don't recall specifically other testimony that related to
41:13	were you using in reaching those conclusions? Is that a statistical judgment?  A. It is. As a statistician and certainly as an expert witness, I think when you're providing testimony to a jury or to the judge you need to take into account who that audience is. And when you provide information, you need to present it in such a way that it wouldn't mislead that consumer of the information.  Q. Okay. And are there any standards in statistics you apply in reaching that conclusion?  A. No, but based on years of experience, you can have some idea as to who your audience is and whether or not they will correctly interpret and use the information you're providing, or whether you need to be more clear and not use statistical jargon, but you need to be clear and make sure that it doesn't potentially mislead someone.  THE COURT: Mr. Warshawsky, for your information, and	01:44:06 5 6 7 8 9 01:44:22 10 11 12 13 14 01:44:38 15 16 17 18 19	executive summary. You talked about missing and destroyed data, drawing from a target population not being possible. You testified at length about that today, right, sir?  A. Correct.  Q. And isn't it true that the mere fact that some data is missing or has been destroyed, that doesn't mean that there are no other copies of that information available, right?  A. Doesn't necessarily mean that there are not other copies. It doesn't mean that there are. It simply means there have been data that are destroyed or missing.  Q. Have you reviewed any of the testimony in this case discussing the redundancy of information within Interior's system?  A. I recall that being in your opening comments. I don't recall specifically other testimony that related to redundancies. You may refresh my recollection.
41:13	were you using in reaching those conclusions? Is that a statistical judgment?  A. It is. As a statistician and certainly as an expert witness, I think when you're providing testimony to a jury or to the judge you need to take into account who that audience is. And when you provide information, you need to present it in such a way that it wouldn't mislead that consumer of the information.  Q. Okay. And are there any standards in statistics you apply in reaching that conclusion?  A. No, but based on years of experience, you can have some idea as to who your audience is and whether or not they will correctly interpret and use the information you're providing, or whether you need to be more clear and not use statistical jargon, but you need to be clear and make sure that it doesn't potentially mislead someone.  THE COURT: Mr. Warshawsky, for your information, and I guess for the information of all counsel here, I've received	01:44:06	executive summary. You talked about missing and destroyed data, drawing from a target population not being possible. You testified at length about that today, right, sir?  A. Correct.  Q. And isn't it true that the mere fact that some data is missing or has been destroyed, that doesn't mean that there are no other copies of that information available, right?  A. Doesn't necessarily mean that there are not other copies. It doesn't mean that there are. It simply means there have been data that are destroyed or missing.  Q. Have you reviewed any of the testimony in this case discussing the redundancy of information within Interior's system?  A. I recall that being in your opening comments. I don't recall specifically other testimony that related to redundancies. You may refresh my recollection.  Q. Well, did you read Dr. Scheuren's testimony?
41:13 5 6 7 8 9 11 11 12 13 14 14 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	were you using in reaching those conclusions? Is that a statistical judgment?  A. It is. As a statistician and certainly as an expert witness, I think when you're providing testimony to a jury or to the judge you need to take into account who that audience is.  And when you provide information, you need to present it in such a way that it wouldn't mislead that consumer of the information.  Q. Okay. And are there any standards in statistics you apply in reaching that conclusion?  A. No, but based on years of experience, you can have some idea as to who your audience is and whether or not they will correctly interpret and use the information you're providing, or whether you need to be more clear and not use statistical jargon, but you need to be clear and make sure that it doesn't potentially mislead someone.  THE COURT: Mr. Warshawsky, for your information, and I guess for the information of all counsel here, I've received this witness's report in evidence, but as you may know, in jury	01:44:06	executive summary. You talked about missing and destroyed data, drawing from a target population not being possible. You testified at length about that today, right, sir?  A. Correct.  Q. And isn't it true that the mere fact that some data is missing or has been destroyed, that doesn't mean that there are no other copies of that information available, right?  A. Doesn't necessarily mean that there are not other copies. It doesn't mean that there are. It simply means there have bee data that are destroyed or missing.  Q. Have you reviewed any of the testimony in this case discussing the redundancy of information within Interior's system?  A. I recall that being in your opening comments. I don't recall specifically other testimony that related to redundancies. You may refresh my recollection.  Q. Well, did you read Dr. Scheuren's testimony?  A. I did.
41:13	were you using in reaching those conclusions? Is that a statistical judgment?  A. It is. As a statistician and certainly as an expert witness, I think when you're providing testimony to a jury or to the judge you need to take into account who that audience is.  And when you provide information, you need to present it in such a way that it wouldn't mislead that consumer of the information.  Q. Okay. And are there any standards in statistics you apply in reaching that conclusion?  A. No, but based on years of experience, you can have some idea as to who your audience is and whether or not they will correctly interpret and use the information you're providing, or whether you need to be more clear and not use statistical jargon, but you need to be clear and make sure that it doesn't potentially mislead someone.  THE COURT: Mr. Warshawsky, for your information, and I guess for the information of all counsel here, I've received this witness's report in evidence, but as you may know, in jury trials it is not usual to receive an expert report in evidence.	01:44:06 5 6 7 8 9 01:44:22 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 01:44:53 20 21 22	executive summary. You talked about missing and destroyed data, drawing from a target population not being possible. You testified at length about that today, right, sir?  A. Correct.  Q. And isn't it true that the mere fact that some data is missing or has been destroyed, that doesn't mean that there are no other copies of that information available, right?  A. Doesn't necessarily mean that there are not other copies. It doesn't mean that there are. It simply means there have been data that are destroyed or missing.  Q. Have you reviewed any of the testimony in this case discussing the redundancy of information within Interior's system?  A. I recall that being in your opening comments. I don't recall specifically other testimony that related to redundancies. You may refresh my recollection.  Q. Well, did you read Dr. Scheuren's testimony?  A. I did.  Q. You don't remember him talking about redundancy?
41:13 5 6 7 8 9 41:26 10 11 12 13 14 141:46 15 16 17 18 19 42:00 20 21 22 23	were you using in reaching those conclusions? Is that a statistical judgment?  A. It is. As a statistician and certainly as an expert witness, I think when you're providing testimony to a jury or to the judge you need to take into account who that audience is. And when you provide information, you need to present it in such a way that it wouldn't mislead that consumer of the information.  Q. Okay. And are there any standards in statistics you apply in reaching that conclusion?  A. No, but based on years of experience, you can have some idea as to who your audience is and whether or not they will correctly interpret and use the information you're providing, or whether you need to be more clear and not use statistical jargon, but you need to be clear and make sure that it doesn't potentially mislead someone.  THE COURT: Mr. Warshawsky, for your information, and I guess for the information of all counsel here, I've received this witness's report in evidence, but as you may know, in jury trials it is not usual to receive an expert report in evidence.  An expert report is handed over to the other side so they can	01:44:06 5 6 7 8 9 01:44:22 10 11 12 13 14 01:44:38 15 16 17 18 19 01:44:53 20 21 22 23	executive summary. You talked about missing and destroyed data, drawing from a target population not being possible. You testified at length about that today, right, sir?  A. Correct.  Q. And isn't it true that the mere fact that some data is missing or has been destroyed, that doesn't mean that there are no other copies of that information available, right?  A. Doesn't necessarily mean that there are not other copies. It doesn't mean that there are. It simply means there have bee data that are destroyed or missing.  Q. Have you reviewed any of the testimony in this case discussing the redundancy of information within Interior's system?  A. I recall that being in your opening comments. I don't recall specifically other testimony that related to redundancies. You may refresh my recollection.  Q. Well, did you read Dr. Scheuren's testimony?  A. I did.  Q. You don't remember him talking about redundancy?  A. It's not jumping off the page at me.
241:13	were you using in reaching those conclusions? Is that a statistical judgment?  A. It is. As a statistician and certainly as an expert witness, I think when you're providing testimony to a jury or to the judge you need to take into account who that audience is.  And when you provide information, you need to present it in such a way that it wouldn't mislead that consumer of the information.  Q. Okay. And are there any standards in statistics you apply in reaching that conclusion?  A. No, but based on years of experience, you can have some idea as to who your audience is and whether or not they will correctly interpret and use the information you're providing, or whether you need to be more clear and not use statistical jargon, but you need to be clear and make sure that it doesn't potentially mislead someone.  THE COURT: Mr. Warshawsky, for your information, and I guess for the information of all counsel here, I've received this witness's report in evidence, but as you may know, in jury trials it is not usual to receive an expert report in evidence.  An expert report is handed over to the other side so they can cross-examine it. But what counts is the opinions rendered in	01:44:06	executive summary. You talked about missing and destroyed data, drawing from a target population not being possible. You testified at length about that today, right, sir?  A. Correct.  Q. And isn't it true that the mere fact that some data is missing or has been destroyed, that doesn't mean that there are no other copies of that information available, right?  A. Doesn't necessarily mean that there are not other copies. It doesn't mean that there are. It simply means there have been data that are destroyed or missing.  Q. Have you reviewed any of the testimony in this case discussing the redundancy of information within Interior's system?  A. I recall that being in your opening comments. I don't recall specifically other testimony that related to redundancies. You may refresh my recollection.  Q. Well, did you read Dr. Scheuren's testimony?  A. I did.  Q. You don't remember him talking about redundancy?  A. It's not jumping off the page at me.  Q. Okay. Is it your opinion that it's impossible to take a
141:13	were you using in reaching those conclusions? Is that a statistical judgment?  A. It is. As a statistician and certainly as an expert witness, I think when you're providing testimony to a jury or to the judge you need to take into account who that audience is.  And when you provide information, you need to present it in such a way that it wouldn't mislead that consumer of the information.  Q. Okay. And are there any standards in statistics you apply in reaching that conclusion?  A. No, but based on years of experience, you can have some idea as to who your audience is and whether or not they will correctly interpret and use the information you're providing, or whether you need to be more clear and not use statistical jargon, but you need to be clear and make sure that it doesn't potentially mislead someone.  THE COURT: Mr. Warshawsky, for your information, and I guess for the information of all counsel here, I've received this witness's report in evidence, but as you may know, in jury trials it is not usual to receive an expert report in evidence.  An expert report is handed over to the other side so they can cross-examine it. But what counts is the opinions rendered in open court.	01:44:06 5 6 7 8 9 01:44:22 10 11 12 13 14 01:44:38 15 16 17 18 19 01:44:53 20 21 22 23	executive summary. You talked about missing and destroyed data, drawing from a target population not being possible. You testified at length about that today, right, sir?  A. Correct.  Q. And isn't it true that the mere fact that some data is missing or has been destroyed, that doesn't mean that there are no other copies of that information available, right?  A. Doesn't necessarily mean that there are not other copies. It doesn't mean that there are. It simply means there have bee data that are destroyed or missing.  Q. Have you reviewed any of the testimony in this case discussing the redundancy of information within Interior's system?  A. I recall that being in your opening comments. I don't recall specifically other testimony that related to redundancies. You may refresh my recollection.  Q. Well, did you read Dr. Scheuren's testimony?  A. I did.  Q. You don't remember him talking about redundancy?  A. It's not jumping off the page at me.  Q. Okay. Is it your opinion that it's impossible to take a valid sample unless you can confirm that the sampling frame
141:13	were you using in reaching those conclusions? Is that a statistical judgment?  A. It is. As a statistician and certainly as an expert witness, I think when you're providing testimony to a jury or to the judge you need to take into account who that audience is.  And when you provide information, you need to present it in such a way that it wouldn't mislead that consumer of the information.  Q. Okay. And are there any standards in statistics you apply in reaching that conclusion?  A. No, but based on years of experience, you can have some idea as to who your audience is and whether or not they will correctly interpret and use the information you're providing, or whether you need to be more clear and not use statistical jargon, but you need to be clear and make sure that it doesn't potentially mislead someone.  THE COURT: Mr. Warshawsky, for your information, and I guess for the information of all counsel here, I've received this witness's report in evidence, but as you may know, in jury trials it is not usual to receive an expert report in evidence.  An expert report is handed over to the other side so they can cross-examine it. But what counts is the opinions rendered in	01:44:06	executive summary. You talked about missing and destroyed data, drawing from a target population not being possible. You testified at length about that today, right, sir?  A. Correct.  Q. And isn't it true that the mere fact that some data is missing or has been destroyed, that doesn't mean that there are no other copies of that information available, right?  A. Doesn't necessarily mean that there are not other copies. It doesn't mean that there are. It simply means there have been data that are destroyed or missing.  Q. Have you reviewed any of the testimony in this case discussing the redundancy of information within Interior's system?  A. I recall that being in your opening comments. I don't recall specifically other testimony that related to redundancies. You may refresh my recollection.  Q. Well, did you read Dr. Scheuren's testimony?  A. I did.  Q. You don't remember him talking about redundancy?  A. It's not jumping off the page at me.  Q. Okay. Is it your opinion that it's impossible to take a

1	1480		1482
	duplicates the target population?	1	advance. As a result, compromises are sometimes required in
2	A. We went around and around on this subject years ago in my	2	developing the sampling frame." That's what we're talking about
3	deposition. But the notion you can take a sample from	3	here, right?
4	anything you want to take a sample from. The notion is what can	4	A. Correct.
01:45:25 <b>5</b>	you do with it when you're done. So you're asking me is it	01:47:59 <b>5</b>	Q. So at least according to this treatise, you can go ahead
6	impossible to take a sample? No, you can take the sample. It	6	and draw a sample even if there are inaccessible or missing data
7	simply limits what you can say with the information from that	7	elements, right?
8	sample.	8	A. We agree on this point. You can draw the sample. The
9	Q. Well, my question for you and Judge Robertson wasn't in	9	compromise that's talked about here is whether or not you're
1:45:39	our deposition years ago, and he wasn't at the 2003 hearing. My	01:48:14 10	going to be able to make any sort of statement about something
11	question for you is is it your opinion that the only way you can	11	that was not available to be sampled from.
12	take a valid sample is if the sampling frame duplicates the	12	Q. Okay. And you're aware from your review and by the way,
13	target population?	13	in your expert report I'll tell you, I didn't go through it.
14	A. You can take a valid sample from anything you want to take	14	I think you indicated you reviewed just about everything in the
1:45:57 15	a sample from. The question is what can you do with that sample	01:48:36 15	administrative record, right?
16	once you're done. Can you say anything about a part of that	16	A. When I prepare my expert report, to be the state court,
17	population that was not available to draw a sample from? It is	17	federal court, or U.S. District Court, I prepare them in
18	my opinion that no, you cannot.	18	compliance with the federal rules of civil procedure, and that
19	Q. Well, why don't you pull up the Reference Manual on	19	would require me to list every document that we have received,
1:46:16 <b>20</b>	Scientific Evidence, Second Edition 2000. Mr. Duncan, are you	01:48:49 <b>20</b>	also called documents considered. I don't limit it to documents
21	familiar with this document?	21	relied upon. So if we received a document, we listed them all,
22	A. I am.	22	whether or not we reviewed them.
23	Q. Would you agree that it's a learned treatise with regard to	23	Q. Oh. So even though in your listing of documents you
24	the various subjects covered within that report?	24	considered, you may not have actually reviewed documents that
1:46:31 <b>25</b>	A. I think generally speaking it is.	01:49:07 <b>25</b>	you listed as having been considered?
	Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR		Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
	Official Court Reporter		Official Court Reporter
	1481		1483
1	Q. Okay. And if you go to page 91 of the document, please,	1	A. Correct. My understanding is that the federal rules
2	this is the reference guide on statistics. Have you seen this	2	require you to list everything that has been received, whether
3	before?	3	or not you reviewed it, or whether or not you've relied upon it.
4	A. I have.		•
_	•	4	Q. You obviously reviewed materials regarding efforts to
_	Q. Now, would you agree that this is a learned treatise on the	01:49:22 5	restore transactions. The DCV, you've talked about that, right?
6	application of statistics?	6	restore transactions. The DCV, you've talked about that, right?  A. Correct.
6 7	application of statistics?  A. Again, I would say generally it is.	6 7	restore transactions. The DCV, you've talked about that, right?  A. Correct.  Q. Aren't those the kinds of efforts that were being discussed
6 7 8	application of statistics?  A. Again, I would say generally it is.  Q. Go to page 240, please. I'm sorry, it's actually not that	6 7 8	restore transactions. The DCV, you've talked about that, right?  A. Correct.  Q. Aren't those the kinds of efforts that were being discussed in that treatise about attempting to take steps to fill those
6 7 8 9	application of statistics?  A. Again, I would say generally it is.  Q. Go to page 240, please. I'm sorry, it's actually not that page. It's page we're going to have to bump it forward.	6 7 8 9	restore transactions. The DCV, you've talked about that, right?  A. Correct.  Q. Aren't those the kinds of efforts that were being discussed in that treatise about attempting to take steps to fill those data gaps?
6 7 8 9 1:47:10	application of statistics?  A. Again, I would say generally it is.  Q. Go to page 240, please. I'm sorry, it's actually not that page. It's page we're going to have to bump it forward.  There we go. The one that has the highlighting. Are you	6 7 8 9 01:49:37 10	restore transactions. The DCV, you've talked about that, right?  A. Correct.  Q. Aren't those the kinds of efforts that were being discussed in that treatise about attempting to take steps to fill those data gaps?  A. Certainly. That's one of the steps that would be
6 7 8 9 1:47:10 10 11	application of statistics?  A. Again, I would say generally it is.  Q. Go to page 240, please. I'm sorry, it's actually not that page. It's page we're going to have to bump it forward.  There we go. The one that has the highlighting. Are you familiar with this section?	6 7 8 9 01:49:37 10 11	restore transactions. The DCV, you've talked about that, right?  A. Correct.  Q. Aren't those the kinds of efforts that were being discussed in that treatise about attempting to take steps to fill those data gaps?  A. Certainly. That's one of the steps that would be anticipated when you have not been able to sample from a target
6 7 8 9 1:47:10 10 11 12	application of statistics?  A. Again, I would say generally it is.  Q. Go to page 240, please. I'm sorry, it's actually not that page. It's page we're going to have to bump it forward.  There we go. The one that has the highlighting. Are you familiar with this section?  A. I am.	6 7 8 9 01:49:37 10 11 12	restore transactions. The DCV, you've talked about that, right?  A. Correct.  Q. Aren't those the kinds of efforts that were being discussed in that treatise about attempting to take steps to fill those data gaps?  A. Certainly. That's one of the steps that would be anticipated when you have not been able to sample from a target population that you want to make an inference about, you can go
6 7 8 9 1:47:10 10 11 12 13	application of statistics?  A. Again, I would say generally it is.  Q. Go to page 240, please. I'm sorry, it's actually not that page. It's page we're going to have to bump it forward.  There we go. The one that has the highlighting. Are you familiar with this section?  A. I am.  Q. In fact, we talked about that four years ago, right?	6 7 8 9 01:49:37 10 11 12 13	restore transactions. The DCV, you've talked about that, right?  A. Correct.  Q. Aren't those the kinds of efforts that were being discussed in that treatise about attempting to take steps to fill those data gaps?  A. Certainly. That's one of the steps that would be anticipated when you have not been able to sample from a targer population that you want to make an inference about, you can go back and see if there's some way to identify why those
6 7 8 9 1:47:10 10 11 12 13 14	application of statistics?  A. Again, I would say generally it is.  Q. Go to page 240, please. I'm sorry, it's actually not that page. It's page we're going to have to bump it forward.  There we go. The one that has the highlighting. Are you familiar with this section?  A. I am.  Q. In fact, we talked about that four years ago, right?  A. Correct.	6 7 8 9 01:49:37 10 11 12 13	restore transactions. The DCV, you've talked about that, right?  A. Correct.  Q. Aren't those the kinds of efforts that were being discussed in that treatise about attempting to take steps to fill those data gaps?  A. Certainly. That's one of the steps that would be anticipated when you have not been able to sample from a targer population that you want to make an inference about, you can go back and see if there's some way to identify why those transactions in this instance were missing, and then you can
6 7 8 9 1:47:10 10 11 12 13 14 1:47:21	application of statistics?  A. Again, I would say generally it is.  Q. Go to page 240, please. I'm sorry, it's actually not that page. It's page we're going to have to bump it forward.  There we go. The one that has the highlighting. Are you familiar with this section?  A. I am.  Q. In fact, we talked about that four years ago, right?  A. Correct.  Q. What is the question being posed about the sampling frame	6 7 8 9 01:49:37 10 11 12 13 14 01:49:53 15	restore transactions. The DCV, you've talked about that, right?  A. Correct.  Q. Aren't those the kinds of efforts that were being discussed in that treatise about attempting to take steps to fill those data gaps?  A. Certainly. That's one of the steps that would be anticipated when you have not been able to sample from a target population that you want to make an inference about, you can go back and see if there's some way to identify why those transactions in this instance were missing, and then you can draw subsamples of those to try to see whether or not they're
6 7 8 9 1:47:10 10 11 12 13 14 14 1:47:21 15	application of statistics?  A. Again, I would say generally it is.  Q. Go to page 240, please. I'm sorry, it's actually not that page. It's page we're going to have to bump it forward.  There we go. The one that has the highlighting. Are you familiar with this section?  A. I am.  Q. In fact, we talked about that four years ago, right?  A. Correct.  Q. What is the question being posed about the sampling frame approximating the population? What's your understanding as an	6 7 8 9 01:49:37 10 11 12 13 14 01:49:53 15	restore transactions. The DCV, you've talked about that, right?  A. Correct.  Q. Aren't those the kinds of efforts that were being discussed in that treatise about attempting to take steps to fill those data gaps?  A. Certainly. That's one of the steps that would be anticipated when you have not been able to sample from a target population that you want to make an inference about, you can go back and see if there's some way to identify why those transactions in this instance were missing, and then you can draw subsamples of those to try to see whether or not they're different.
6 7 8 9 11:47:10 10 11 12 13 14 14 1:47:21 15 16 17	application of statistics?  A. Again, I would say generally it is.  Q. Go to page 240, please. I'm sorry, it's actually not that page. It's page we're going to have to bump it forward.  There we go. The one that has the highlighting. Are you familiar with this section?  A. I am.  Q. In fact, we talked about that four years ago, right?  A. Correct.  Q. What is the question being posed about the sampling frame approximating the population? What's your understanding as an expert?	6 7 8 9 01:49:37 10 11 12 13 14 01:49:53 15 16 17	restore transactions. The DCV, you've talked about that, right?  A. Correct.  Q. Aren't those the kinds of efforts that were being discussed in that treatise about attempting to take steps to fill those data gaps?  A. Certainly. That's one of the steps that would be anticipated when you have not been able to sample from a target population that you want to make an inference about, you can go back and see if there's some way to identify why those transactions in this instance were missing, and then you can draw subsamples of those to try to see whether or not they're different.  Q. You talked about this. Why don't we go ahead and pull up
6 7 8 9 1:47:10 10 11 12 13 14 1:47:21 15 16 17 18	application of statistics?  A. Again, I would say generally it is.  Q. Go to page 240, please. I'm sorry, it's actually not that page. It's page we're going to have to bump it forward.  There we go. The one that has the highlighting. Are you familiar with this section?  A. I am.  Q. In fact, we talked about that four years ago, right?  A. Correct.  Q. What is the question being posed about the sampling frame approximating the population? What's your understanding as an expert?  A. It really goes right to this issue of have you constructed	6 7 8 9 01:49:37 10 11 12 13 14 01:49:53 15 16 17	restore transactions. The DCV, you've talked about that, right?  A. Correct.  Q. Aren't those the kinds of efforts that were being discussed in that treatise about attempting to take steps to fill those data gaps?  A. Certainly. That's one of the steps that would be anticipated when you have not been able to sample from a target population that you want to make an inference about, you can go back and see if there's some way to identify why those transactions in this instance were missing, and then you can draw subsamples of those to try to see whether or not they're different.  Q. You talked about this. Why don't we go ahead and pull up Plaintiff's Exhibit 4485. This is your demonstrative. Go to
6 7 8 9 1:47:10 10 11 12 13 14 1:47:21 15 16 17 18	application of statistics?  A. Again, I would say generally it is.  Q. Go to page 240, please. I'm sorry, it's actually not that page. It's page we're going to have to bump it forward.  There we go. The one that has the highlighting. Are you familiar with this section?  A. I am.  Q. In fact, we talked about that four years ago, right?  A. Correct.  Q. What is the question being posed about the sampling frame approximating the population? What's your understanding as an expert?  A. It really goes right to this issue of have you constructed your sample, the sampling frame, which is how you're going to	6 7 8 9 01:49:37 10 11 12 13 14 01:49:53 15 16 17 18 19	restore transactions. The DCV, you've talked about that, right?  A. Correct.  Q. Aren't those the kinds of efforts that were being discussed in that treatise about attempting to take steps to fill those data gaps?  A. Certainly. That's one of the steps that would be anticipated when you have not been able to sample from a target population that you want to make an inference about, you can go back and see if there's some way to identify why those transactions in this instance were missing, and then you can draw subsamples of those to try to see whether or not they're different.  Q. You talked about this. Why don't we go ahead and pull up Plaintiff's Exhibit 4485. This is your demonstrative. Go to the third page. This is also, I believe, depicted in your
1:47:10	application of statistics?  A. Again, I would say generally it is.  Q. Go to page 240, please. I'm sorry, it's actually not that page. It's page we're going to have to bump it forward.  There we go. The one that has the highlighting. Are you familiar with this section?  A. I am.  Q. In fact, we talked about that four years ago, right?  A. Correct.  Q. What is the question being posed about the sampling frame approximating the population? What's your understanding as an expert?  A. It really goes right to this issue of have you constructed your sample, the sampling frame, which is how you're going to draw the sample, have you done it in such a way that you can	01:49:37 10 01:49:37 10 11 12 13 14 01:49:53 15 16 17 18 19	restore transactions. The DCV, you've talked about that, right?  A. Correct.  Q. Aren't those the kinds of efforts that were being discussed in that treatise about attempting to take steps to fill those data gaps?  A. Certainly. That's one of the steps that would be anticipated when you have not been able to sample from a target population that you want to make an inference about, you can go back and see if there's some way to identify why those transactions in this instance were missing, and then you can draw subsamples of those to try to see whether or not they're different.  Q. You talked about this. Why don't we go ahead and pull up Plaintiff's Exhibit 4485. This is your demonstrative. Go to the third page. This is also, I believe, depicted in your expert report, right?
1:47:21	application of statistics?  A. Again, I would say generally it is.  Q. Go to page 240, please. I'm sorry, it's actually not that page. It's page we're going to have to bump it forward.  There we go. The one that has the highlighting. Are you familiar with this section?  A. I am.  Q. In fact, we talked about that four years ago, right?  A. Correct.  Q. What is the question being posed about the sampling frame approximating the population? What's your understanding as an expert?  A. It really goes right to this issue of have you constructed your sample, the sampling frame, which is how you're going to draw the sample, have you done it in such a way that you can approximate what the population is that you would like to make a	6 7 8 9 01:49:37 10 11 12 13 14 01:49:53 15 16 17 18 19 01:50:12 20 21	restore transactions. The DCV, you've talked about that, right?  A. Correct.  Q. Aren't those the kinds of efforts that were being discussed in that treatise about attempting to take steps to fill those data gaps?  A. Certainly. That's one of the steps that would be anticipated when you have not been able to sample from a target population that you want to make an inference about, you can go back and see if there's some way to identify why those transactions in this instance were missing, and then you can draw subsamples of those to try to see whether or not they're different.  Q. You talked about this. Why don't we go ahead and pull up Plaintiff's Exhibit 4485. This is your demonstrative. Go to the third page. This is also, I believe, depicted in your expert report, right?  A. Correct.
147:10 10 11 12 13 14 147:21 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	application of statistics?  A. Again, I would say generally it is.  Q. Go to page 240, please. I'm sorry, it's actually not that page. It's page we're going to have to bump it forward.  There we go. The one that has the highlighting. Are you familiar with this section?  A. I am.  Q. In fact, we talked about that four years ago, right?  A. Correct.  Q. What is the question being posed about the sampling frame approximating the population? What's your understanding as an expert?  A. It really goes right to this issue of have you constructed your sample, the sampling frame, which is how you're going to draw the sample, have you done it in such a way that you can approximate what the population is that you would like to make a statement about.	6 7 8 9 01:49:37 10 11 12 13 14 01:49:53 15 16 17 18 19 01:50:12 20 21 22	restore transactions. The DCV, you've talked about that, right?  A. Correct.  Q. Aren't those the kinds of efforts that were being discussed in that treatise about attempting to take steps to fill those data gaps?  A. Certainly. That's one of the steps that would be anticipated when you have not been able to sample from a targer population that you want to make an inference about, you can go back and see if there's some way to identify why those transactions in this instance were missing, and then you can draw subsamples of those to try to see whether or not they're different.  Q. You talked about this. Why don't we go ahead and pull up Plaintiff's Exhibit 4485. This is your demonstrative. Go to the third page. This is also, I believe, depicted in your expert report, right?  A. Correct.  Q. Now, in the second box there, it looks like the recorded
6 7 8 9 1147:10 10 11 12 13 14 1147:21 15 16 17 18 19 1147:35 20 21 22 23	application of statistics?  A. Again, I would say generally it is.  Q. Go to page 240, please. I'm sorry, it's actually not that page. It's page we're going to have to bump it forward.  There we go. The one that has the highlighting. Are you familiar with this section?  A. I am.  Q. In fact, we talked about that four years ago, right?  A. Correct.  Q. What is the question being posed about the sampling frame approximating the population? What's your understanding as an expert?  A. It really goes right to this issue of have you constructed your sample, the sampling frame, which is how you're going to draw the sample, have you done it in such a way that you can approximate what the population is that you would like to make a statement about.  Q. And you see the last two sentences that I've highlighted	6 7 8 9 01:49:37 10 11 12 13 14 01:49:53 15 16 17 18 19 01:50:12 20 21 22 23	restore transactions. The DCV, you've talked about that, right?  A. Correct.  Q. Aren't those the kinds of efforts that were being discussed in that treatise about attempting to take steps to fill those data gaps?  A. Certainly. That's one of the steps that would be anticipated when you have not been able to sample from a target population that you want to make an inference about, you can go back and see if there's some way to identify why those transactions in this instance were missing, and then you can draw subsamples of those to try to see whether or not they're different.  Q. You talked about this. Why don't we go ahead and pull up Plaintiff's Exhibit 4485. This is your demonstrative. Go to the third page. This is also, I believe, depicted in your expert report, right?  A. Correct.  Q. Now, in the second box there, it looks like the recorded transactions is roughly one fourth of the total population; is
1:47:10 10 11 12 13 14 1:47:21 15 16 17 18 19 1:47:35 20 21 22 23 24	application of statistics?  A. Again, I would say generally it is.  Q. Go to page 240, please. I'm sorry, it's actually not that page. It's page we're going to have to bump it forward.  There we go. The one that has the highlighting. Are you familiar with this section?  A. I am.  Q. In fact, we talked about that four years ago, right?  A. Correct.  Q. What is the question being posed about the sampling frame approximating the population? What's your understanding as an expert?  A. It really goes right to this issue of have you constructed your sample, the sampling frame, which is how you're going to draw the sample, have you done it in such a way that you can approximate what the population is that you would like to make a statement about.  Q. And you see the last two sentences that I've highlighted there: "Frequently, however, the target population includes	6 7 8 9 01:49:37 10 11 12 13 14 01:49:53 15 16 17 18 19 01:50:12 20 21 22 23 24	restore transactions. The DCV, you've talked about that, right?  A. Correct.  Q. Aren't those the kinds of efforts that were being discussed in that treatise about attempting to take steps to fill those data gaps?  A. Certainly. That's one of the steps that would be anticipated when you have not been able to sample from a target population that you want to make an inference about, you can go back and see if there's some way to identify why those transactions in this instance were missing, and then you can draw subsamples of those to try to see whether or not they're different.  Q. You talked about this. Why don't we go ahead and pull up Plaintiff's Exhibit 4485. This is your demonstrative. Go to the third page. This is also, I believe, depicted in your expert report, right?  A. Correct.  Q. Now, in the second box there, it looks like the recorded transactions is roughly one fourth of the total population; is that correct?
6 7 8 9 01:47:10 10 11 12 13 14 01:47:21 15 16 17 18 19 01:47:35 20 21 22 23	application of statistics?  A. Again, I would say generally it is.  Q. Go to page 240, please. I'm sorry, it's actually not that page. It's page we're going to have to bump it forward.  There we go. The one that has the highlighting. Are you familiar with this section?  A. I am.  Q. In fact, we talked about that four years ago, right?  A. Correct.  Q. What is the question being posed about the sampling frame approximating the population? What's your understanding as an expert?  A. It really goes right to this issue of have you constructed your sample, the sampling frame, which is how you're going to draw the sample, have you done it in such a way that you can approximate what the population is that you would like to make a statement about.  Q. And you see the last two sentences that I've highlighted	6 7 8 9 01:49:37 10 11 12 13 14 01:49:53 15 16 17 18 19 01:50:12 20 21 22 23	restore transactions. The DCV, you've talked about that, right?  A. Correct.  Q. Aren't those the kinds of efforts that were being discussed in that treatise about attempting to take steps to fill those data gaps?  A. Certainly. That's one of the steps that would be anticipated when you have not been able to sample from a target population that you want to make an inference about, you can go back and see if there's some way to identify why those transactions in this instance were missing, and then you can draw subsamples of those to try to see whether or not they're different.  Q. You talked about this. Why don't we go ahead and pull up Plaintiff's Exhibit 4485. This is your demonstrative. Go to the third page. This is also, I believe, depicted in your expert report, right?  A. Correct.  Q. Now, in the second box there, it looks like the recorded transactions is roughly one fourth of the total population; is

	1484		1486
1	Q. Do you have any factual basis for telling Judge Robertson	1	were, right?
2	that in fact the sampling frame in this case is about one fourth	2	A. Correct.
3	of the target population?	3	Q. So you don't know if that's an auditor's concept?
4	A. I don't think anybody knows how big that missing and	4	A. I've reviewed the ASM to see whether or not it's something
01:50:40 <b>5</b>	omitted component is.	01:54:24 <b>5</b>	they laid out in the ASM as an auditor's concept. I didn't see
6	Q. Okay. So as far as you're aware, the sampled population	6	anything there that made it clear what this notion of the
7	and the target population may actually be fairly close in size.	7	alternative procedure was.
8	We know they're not identical, but close?	8	Q. Okay. But speaking more generally, you don't know whether
9	,	9	
01:50:56 10	A. I would have no basis, nor have I seen anything in the	01:54:39 10	auditors routinely talk about utilizing alternative procedures
	administrative record that indicates what the relative size of		in the course of doing audit work; is that correct?
11	those two boxes is.	11	A. I've encountered the term before in working with
12	Q. So Judge Robertson, when he looks at this diagram,	12	PricewaterhouseCoopers.
13	shouldn't draw any conclusions as to the size of the, relative	13	Q. When you saw that term utilized in connection with the work
14	size of those two boxes; is that correct?	14	here, did it occur to you that "alternative procedures" was an
01:51:14 15	A. No. I perhaps should put on the bottom "not necessarily to	01:54:59 15	auditor's term of art?
16	scale." We don't know.	16	A. I'm generally familiar with the term as it's been used by
17	Q. Okay. You indicated in your direct examination that you	17	accountants when I did work in helping design statistical
18	reviewed the September 30, 2005, NORC report regarding the	18	sampling when I was at PricewaterhouseCoopers, so I've heard
19	reconciliation of the national sample and the high-dollar items.	19	"alternative procedures" used in different contexts among
01:51:35 <b>20</b>	This was AR-438, Bates No. 40-00002. Let's try to find it maybe	01:55:14 <b>20</b>	accountants.
21	in the administrative record. AR-438.	21	<b>Q.</b> So basically you rejected the conclusion in table 4 about
22	And in reaching your conclusions about missing or destroyed	22	reconciling all but nine of the transactions because of your
23	data, the impossibility of doing the reconciliation work, you	23	understanding of how errors were determined; is that correct?
24	considered pages 12 to 17 of the report.	24	A. Well, you're mixing two different concepts. You talked
01:52:29 <b>25</b>	Why don't you show Mr. Duncan 12 through 17.	01:55:32 <b>25</b>	about reconciled and you talked about errors. Reconciled is the
	Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR		Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
	Official Court Reporter		Official Court Reporter
	1485		1487
1	1485 Does this look familiar?	1	1487 first step. The second step is whether or not there's an error.
1 2		1 2	
	Does this look familiar?		first step. The second step is whether or not there's an error.
2	Does this look familiar?  A. Yes, it does.	2	first step. The second step is whether or not there's an error.  Q. All right. You rejected the conclusion that all but nine
2 3	Does this look familiar?  A. Yes, it does.  Q. And on page 13 of the report, table 4, how did you evaluate	3	first step. The second step is whether or not there's an error.  Q. All right. You rejected the conclusion that all but nine transactions had been reconciled because of your understanding
2 3 4	Does this look familiar?  A. Yes, it does.  Q. And on page 13 of the report, table 4, how did you evaluate the fact that the table indicates that all but nine out of 2,372	2 3 4	first step. The second step is whether or not there's an error.  Q. All right. You rejected the conclusion that all but nine transactions had been reconciled because of your understanding of the standard required to reconcile a transaction; is that
2 3 4 01:53:05 5	Does this look familiar?  A. Yes, it does.  Q. And on page 13 of the report, table 4, how did you evaluate the fact that the table indicates that all but nine out of 2,372 transactions had been reconciled?	2 3 4 01:55:52 5	<b>Q.</b> All right. You rejected the conclusion that all but nine transactions had been reconciled because of your understanding of the standard required to reconcile a transaction; is that correct?
2 3 4 01:53:05 5 6	Does this look familiar?  A. Yes, it does.  Q. And on page 13 of the report, table 4, how did you evaluate the fact that the table indicates that all but nine out of 2,372 transactions had been reconciled?  A. This goes right back to the notion of the high, high hurdle	2 3 4 01:55:52 5 6	first step. The second step is whether or not there's an error.  Q. All right. You rejected the conclusion that all but nine transactions had been reconciled because of your understanding of the standard required to reconcile a transaction; is that correct?  A. I don't know that I rejected or discounted the notion. It
2 3 4 01:53:05 5 6 7	Does this look familiar?  A. Yes, it does.  Q. And on page 13 of the report, table 4, how did you evaluate the fact that the table indicates that all but nine out of 2,372 transactions had been reconciled?  A. This goes right back to the notion of the high, high hurdle to be considered unreconciled.	2 3 4 01:55:52 5 6 7	first step. The second step is whether or not there's an error.  Q. All right. You rejected the conclusion that all but nine transactions had been reconciled because of your understanding of the standard required to reconcile a transaction; is that correct?  A. I don't know that I rejected or discounted the notion. It was reported here that it was reconciled. It was just my
2 3 4 01:53:05 5 6 7 8	Does this look familiar?  A. Yes, it does.  Q. And on page 13 of the report, table 4, how did you evaluate the fact that the table indicates that all but nine out of 2,372 transactions had been reconciled?  A. This goes right back to the notion of the high, high hurdle to be considered unreconciled.  Q. I'm sorry?	2 3 4 01:55:52 5 6 7 8	first step. The second step is whether or not there's an error.  Q. All right. You rejected the conclusion that all but nine transactions had been reconciled because of your understanding of the standard required to reconcile a transaction; is that correct?  A. I don't know that I rejected or discounted the notion. It was reported here that it was reconciled. It was just my opinion that given the hurdle associated with not being able to
2 3 4 01:53:05 5 6 7 8 9	Does this look familiar?  A. Yes, it does.  Q. And on page 13 of the report, table 4, how did you evaluate the fact that the table indicates that all but nine out of 2,372 transactions had been reconciled?  A. This goes right back to the notion of the high, high hurdle to be considered unreconciled.  Q. I'm sorry?  A. It goes back to the high, high hurdle to be considered	2 3 4 01:55:52 5 6 7 8 9	first step. The second step is whether or not there's an error.  Q. All right. You rejected the conclusion that all but nine transactions had been reconciled because of your understanding of the standard required to reconcile a transaction; is that correct?  A. I don't know that I rejected or discounted the notion. It was reported here that it was reconciled. It was just my opinion that given the hurdle associated with not being able to be reconciled, that this doesn't hold any particular meaning to
2 3 4 01:53:05 5 6 7 8 9 01:53:18 10 11	Does this look familiar?  A. Yes, it does.  Q. And on page 13 of the report, table 4, how did you evaluate the fact that the table indicates that all but nine out of 2,372 transactions had been reconciled?  A. This goes right back to the notion of the high, high hurdle to be considered unreconciled.  Q. I'm sorry?  A. It goes back to the high, high hurdle to be considered unreconciled. So here what it's saying is if it was accounting	2 3 4 01:55:52 5 6 7 8 9 01:56:08 10 11	first step. The second step is whether or not there's an error.  Q. All right. You rejected the conclusion that all but nine transactions had been reconciled because of your understanding of the standard required to reconcile a transaction; is that correct?  A. I don't know that I rejected or discounted the notion. It was reported here that it was reconciled. It was just my opinion that given the hurdle associated with not being able to be reconciled, that this doesn't hold any particular meaning to the individual account holder.
2 3 4 01:53:05 5 6 7 8 9 01:53:18 10 11 12 13	Does this look familiar?  A. Yes, it does.  Q. And on page 13 of the report, table 4, how did you evaluate the fact that the table indicates that all but nine out of 2,372 transactions had been reconciled?  A. This goes right back to the notion of the high, high hurdle to be considered unreconciled.  Q. I'm sorry?  A. It goes back to the high, high hurdle to be considered unreconciled. So here what it's saying is if it was accounting code 1 or 2, which comprises these alternative procedures, it	2 3 4 01:55:52 5 6 7 8 9 01:56:08 10	first step. The second step is whether or not there's an error.  Q. All right. You rejected the conclusion that all but nine transactions had been reconciled because of your understanding of the standard required to reconcile a transaction; is that correct?  A. I don't know that I rejected or discounted the notion. It was reported here that it was reconciled. It was just my opinion that given the hurdle associated with not being able to be reconciled, that this doesn't hold any particular meaning to the individual account holder.  Q. Okay. As a statistician, though, if it's reported to you
2 3 4 01:53:05 5 6 7 8 9 01:53:18 10 11	A. Yes, it does.  Q. And on page 13 of the report, table 4, how did you evaluate the fact that the table indicates that all but nine out of 2,372 transactions had been reconciled?  A. This goes right back to the notion of the high, high hurdle to be considered unreconciled.  Q. I'm sorry?  A. It goes back to the high, high hurdle to be considered unreconciled. So here what it's saying is if it was accounting code 1 or 2, which comprises these alternative procedures, it would be considered it would be listed in the reconciled	2 3 4 01:55:52 5 6 7 8 9 01:56:08 10 11	first step. The second step is whether or not there's an error.  Q. All right. You rejected the conclusion that all but nine transactions had been reconciled because of your understanding of the standard required to reconcile a transaction; is that correct?  A. I don't know that I rejected or discounted the notion. It was reported here that it was reconciled. It was just my opinion that given the hurdle associated with not being able to be reconciled, that this doesn't hold any particular meaning to the individual account holder.  Q. Okay. As a statistician, though, if it's reported to you that all but nine out of almost 2,400 transactions was
2 3 4 01:53:05 5 6 7 8 9 01:53:18 10 11 12 13	A. Yes, it does.  Q. And on page 13 of the report, table 4, how did you evaluate the fact that the table indicates that all but nine out of 2,372 transactions had been reconciled?  A. This goes right back to the notion of the high, high hurdle to be considered unreconciled.  Q. I'm sorry?  A. It goes back to the high, high hurdle to be considered unreconciled. So here what it's saying is if it was accounting code 1 or 2, which comprises these alternative procedures, it would be considered it would be listed in the reconciled section. But because we don't know what those alternative	2 3 4 01:55:52 5 6 7 8 9 01:56:08 10 11 12 13	first step. The second step is whether or not there's an error.  Q. All right. You rejected the conclusion that all but nine transactions had been reconciled because of your understanding of the standard required to reconcile a transaction; is that correct?  A. I don't know that I rejected or discounted the notion. It was reported here that it was reconciled. It was just my opinion that given the hurdle associated with not being able to be reconciled, that this doesn't hold any particular meaning to the individual account holder.  Q. Okay. As a statistician, though, if it's reported to you that all but nine out of almost 2,400 transactions was reconciled, in your mind you would still consider there to be a
2 3 4 01:53:05 5 6 7 8 9 01:53:18 10 11 12 13 14	A. Yes, it does.  Q. And on page 13 of the report, table 4, how did you evaluate the fact that the table indicates that all but nine out of 2,372 transactions had been reconciled?  A. This goes right back to the notion of the high, high hurdle to be considered unreconciled.  Q. I'm sorry?  A. It goes back to the high, high hurdle to be considered unreconciled. So here what it's saying is if it was accounting code 1 or 2, which comprises these alternative procedures, it would be considered it would be listed in the reconciled section. But because we don't know what those alternative procedures are, and they may or may not be directly reconciled	2 3 4 01:55:52 5 6 7 8 9 01:56:08 10 11 12 13 14	first step. The second step is whether or not there's an error.  Q. All right. You rejected the conclusion that all but nine transactions had been reconciled because of your understanding of the standard required to reconcile a transaction; is that correct?  A. I don't know that I rejected or discounted the notion. It was reported here that it was reconciled. It was just my opinion that given the hurdle associated with not being able to be reconciled, that this doesn't hold any particular meaning to the individual account holder.  Q. Okay. As a statistician, though, if it's reported to you that all but nine out of almost 2,400 transactions was reconciled, in your mind you would still consider there to be a problem with missing data?
2 3 4 01:53:05 5 6 7 8 9 01:53:18 10 11 12 13 14 01:53:36 15	A. Yes, it does.  Q. And on page 13 of the report, table 4, how did you evaluate the fact that the table indicates that all but nine out of 2,372 transactions had been reconciled?  A. This goes right back to the notion of the high, high hurdle to be considered unreconciled.  Q. I'm sorry?  A. It goes back to the high, high hurdle to be considered unreconciled. So here what it's saying is if it was accounting code 1 or 2, which comprises these alternative procedures, it would be considered — it would be listed in the reconciled section. But because we don't know what those alternative procedures are, and they may or may not be directly reconciled back to a supporting document but rather be subject to some	2 3 4 01:55:52 5 6 7 8 9 01:56:08 10 11 12 13 14 01:56:27 15	first step. The second step is whether or not there's an error.  Q. All right. You rejected the conclusion that all but nine transactions had been reconciled because of your understanding of the standard required to reconcile a transaction; is that correct?  A. I don't know that I rejected or discounted the notion. It was reported here that it was reconciled. It was just my opinion that given the hurdle associated with not being able to be reconciled, that this doesn't hold any particular meaning to the individual account holder.  Q. Okay. As a statistician, though, if it's reported to you that all but nine out of almost 2,400 transactions was reconciled, in your mind you would still consider there to be a problem with missing data?  A. Well, this goes to how the error rates and the
2 3 4 01:53:05 5 6 7 8 9 01:53:18 10 11 12 13 14 01:53:36 15 16	A. Yes, it does.  Q. And on page 13 of the report, table 4, how did you evaluate the fact that the table indicates that all but nine out of 2,372 transactions had been reconciled?  A. This goes right back to the notion of the high, high hurdle to be considered unreconciled.  Q. I'm sorry?  A. It goes back to the high, high hurdle to be considered unreconciled. So here what it's saying is if it was accounting code 1 or 2, which comprises these alternative procedures, it would be considered it would be listed in the reconciled section. But because we don't know what those alternative procedures are, and they may or may not be directly reconciled back to a supporting document but rather be subject to some judgment of the accountants, the notion of reconciled here, as	2 3 4 01:55:52 5 6 7 8 9 01:56:08 10 11 12 13 14 01:56:27 15	first step. The second step is whether or not there's an error.  Q. All right. You rejected the conclusion that all but nine transactions had been reconciled because of your understanding of the standard required to reconcile a transaction; is that correct?  A. I don't know that I rejected or discounted the notion. It was reported here that it was reconciled. It was just my opinion that given the hurdle associated with not being able to be reconciled, that this doesn't hold any particular meaning to the individual account holder.  Q. Okay. As a statistician, though, if it's reported to you that all but nine out of almost 2,400 transactions was reconciled, in your mind you would still consider there to be a problem with missing data?  A. Well, this goes to how the error rates and the reconciliation process is determined, and statisticians, as with
2 3 4 01:53:05 5 6 7 8 9 01:53:18 10 11 12 13 14 01:53:36 15 16 17	A. Yes, it does.  Q. And on page 13 of the report, table 4, how did you evaluate the fact that the table indicates that all but nine out of 2,372 transactions had been reconciled?  A. This goes right back to the notion of the high, high hurdle to be considered unreconciled.  Q. I'm sorry?  A. It goes back to the high, high hurdle to be considered unreconciled. So here what it's saying is if it was accounting code 1 or 2, which comprises these alternative procedures, it would be considered it would be listed in the reconciled section. But because we don't know what those alternative procedures are, and they may or may not be directly reconciled back to a supporting document but rather be subject to some judgment of the accountants, the notion of reconciled here, as I've testified to, would be meaningless to an individual account	2 3 4 01:55:52 5 6 7 8 9 01:56:08 10 11 12 13 14 01:56:27 15	first step. The second step is whether or not there's an error.  Q. All right. You rejected the conclusion that all but nine transactions had been reconciled because of your understanding of the standard required to reconcile a transaction; is that correct?  A. I don't know that I rejected or discounted the notion. It was reported here that it was reconciled. It was just my opinion that given the hurdle associated with not being able to be reconciled, that this doesn't hold any particular meaning to the individual account holder.  Q. Okay. As a statistician, though, if it's reported to you that all but nine out of almost 2,400 transactions was reconciled, in your mind you would still consider there to be a problem with missing data?  A. Well, this goes to how the error rates and the reconciliation process is determined, and statisticians, as with your clients, Dr. Scheuren and Dr. Hinkins, had input, they had
2 3 4 01:53:05 5 6 7 8 9 01:53:18 10 11 12 13 14 01:53:36 15 16 17 18	A. Yes, it does.  Q. And on page 13 of the report, table 4, how did you evaluate the fact that the table indicates that all but nine out of 2,372 transactions had been reconciled?  A. This goes right back to the notion of the high, high hurdle to be considered unreconciled.  Q. I'm sorry?  A. It goes back to the high, high hurdle to be considered unreconciled. So here what it's saying is if it was accounting code 1 or 2, which comprises these alternative procedures, it would be considered — it would be listed in the reconciled section. But because we don't know what those alternative procedures are, and they may or may not be directly reconciled back to a supporting document but rather be subject to some judgment of the accountants, the notion of reconciled here, as I've testified to, would be meaningless to an individual account holder.	2 3 4 01:55:52 5 6 7 8 9 01:56:08 10 11 12 13 14 01:56:27 15 16 17 18	first step. The second step is whether or not there's an error.  Q. All right. You rejected the conclusion that all but nine transactions had been reconciled because of your understanding of the standard required to reconcile a transaction; is that correct?  A. I don't know that I rejected or discounted the notion. It was reported here that it was reconciled. It was just my opinion that given the hurdle associated with not being able to be reconciled, that this doesn't hold any particular meaning to the individual account holder.  Q. Okay. As a statistician, though, if it's reported to you that all but nine out of almost 2,400 transactions was reconciled, in your mind you would still consider there to be a problem with missing data?  A. Well, this goes to how the error rates and the reconciliation process is determined, and statisticians, as with your clients, Dr. Scheuren and Dr. Hinkins, had input, they had involvement in the discussion of what was reconciled and what
2 3 4 01:53:05 5 6 7 8 9 01:53:18 10 11 12 13 14 01:53:36 15 16 17 18 19	A. Yes, it does.  Q. And on page 13 of the report, table 4, how did you evaluate the fact that the table indicates that all but nine out of 2,372 transactions had been reconciled?  A. This goes right back to the notion of the high, high hurdle to be considered unreconciled.  Q. I'm sorry?  A. It goes back to the high, high hurdle to be considered unreconciled. So here what it's saying is if it was accounting code 1 or 2, which comprises these alternative procedures, it would be considered — it would be listed in the reconciled section. But because we don't know what those alternative procedures are, and they may or may not be directly reconciled back to a supporting document but rather be subject to some judgment of the accountants, the notion of reconciled here, as I've testified to, would be meaningless to an individual account holder.  Q. Well, you're a CFA but you're not a CPA, right?	2 3 4 01:55:52 5 6 7 8 9 01:56:08 10 11 12 13 14 01:56:27 15 16 17 18 19	first step. The second step is whether or not there's an error.  Q. All right. You rejected the conclusion that all but nine transactions had been reconciled because of your understanding of the standard required to reconcile a transaction; is that correct?  A. I don't know that I rejected or discounted the notion. It was reported here that it was reconciled. It was just my opinion that given the hurdle associated with not being able to be reconciled, that this doesn't hold any particular meaning to the individual account holder.  Q. Okay. As a statistician, though, if it's reported to you that all but nine out of almost 2,400 transactions was reconciled, in your mind you would still consider there to be a problem with missing data?  A. Well, this goes to how the error rates and the reconciliation process is determined, and statisticians, as with your clients, Dr. Scheuren and Dr. Hinkins, had input, they had involvement in the discussion of what was reconciled and what wasn't. So it matters because it then how one uses the
2 3 4 01:53:05 5 6 7 8 9 01:53:18 10 11 12 13 14 01:53:36 15 16 17 18 19 01:53:55 20	A. Yes, it does.  Q. And on page 13 of the report, table 4, how did you evaluate the fact that the table indicates that all but nine out of 2,372 transactions had been reconciled?  A. This goes right back to the notion of the high, high hurdle to be considered unreconciled.  Q. I'm sorry?  A. It goes back to the high, high hurdle to be considered unreconciled. So here what it's saying is if it was accounting code 1 or 2, which comprises these alternative procedures, it would be considered it would be listed in the reconciled section. But because we don't know what those alternative procedures are, and they may or may not be directly reconciled back to a supporting document but rather be subject to some judgment of the accountants, the notion of reconciled here, as I've testified to, would be meaningless to an individual account holder.  Q. Well, you're a CFA but you're not a CPA, right?  A. That's correct.	2 3 4 01:55:52 5 6 7 8 9 01:56:08 10 11 12 13 14 01:56:27 15 16 17 18 19 01:56:47 20	first step. The second step is whether or not there's an error.  Q. All right. You rejected the conclusion that all but nine transactions had been reconciled because of your understanding of the standard required to reconcile a transaction; is that correct?  A. I don't know that I rejected or discounted the notion. It was reported here that it was reconciled. It was just my opinion that given the hurdle associated with not being able to be reconciled, that this doesn't hold any particular meaning to the individual account holder.  Q. Okay. As a statistician, though, if it's reported to you that all but nine out of almost 2,400 transactions was reconciled, in your mind you would still consider there to be a problem with missing data?  A. Well, this goes to how the error rates and the reconciliation process is determined, and statisticians, as with your clients, Dr. Scheuren and Dr. Hinkins, had input, they had involvement in the discussion of what was reconciled and what wasn't. So it matters because it then how one uses the result of that reconciliation activity is premised in part, in
2 3 4 01:53:05 5 6 7 8 9 01:53:18 10 11 12 13 14 01:53:36 15 16 17 18 19 01:53:55 20 21	A. Yes, it does.  Q. And on page 13 of the report, table 4, how did you evaluate the fact that the table indicates that all but nine out of 2,372 transactions had been reconciled?  A. This goes right back to the notion of the high, high hurdle to be considered unreconciled.  Q. I'm sorry?  A. It goes back to the high, high hurdle to be considered unreconciled. So here what it's saying is if it was accounting code 1 or 2, which comprises these alternative procedures, it would be considered it would be listed in the reconciled section. But because we don't know what those alternative procedures are, and they may or may not be directly reconciled back to a supporting document but rather be subject to some judgment of the accountants, the notion of reconciled here, as I've testified to, would be meaningless to an individual account holder.  Q. Well, you're a CFA but you're not a CPA, right?  A. That's correct.  Q. And so you're not here today to offer opinions about what	2 3 4 01:55:52 5 6 7 8 9 01:56:08 10 11 12 13 14 01:56:27 15 16 17 18 19 01:56:47 20 21	first step. The second step is whether or not there's an error.  Q. All right. You rejected the conclusion that all but nine transactions had been reconciled because of your understanding of the standard required to reconcile a transaction; is that correct?  A. I don't know that I rejected or discounted the notion. It was reported here that it was reconciled. It was just my opinion that given the hurdle associated with not being able to be reconciled, that this doesn't hold any particular meaning to the individual account holder.  Q. Okay. As a statistician, though, if it's reported to you that all but nine out of almost 2,400 transactions was reconciled, in your mind you would still consider there to be a problem with missing data?  A. Well, this goes to how the error rates and the reconciliation process is determined, and statisticians, as with your clients, Dr. Scheuren and Dr. Hinkins, had input, they had involvement in the discussion of what was reconciled and what wasn't. So it matters because it then how one uses the result of that reconciliation activity is premised in part, in large part upon what the reconciliation means.
2 3 4 01:53:05 5 6 7 8 9 01:53:18 10 11 12 13 14 01:53:36 15 16 17 18 19 01:53:55 20 21 22	A. Yes, it does.  Q. And on page 13 of the report, table 4, how did you evaluate the fact that the table indicates that all but nine out of 2,372 transactions had been reconciled?  A. This goes right back to the notion of the high, high hurdle to be considered unreconciled.  Q. I'm sorry?  A. It goes back to the high, high hurdle to be considered unreconciled. So here what it's saying is if it was accounting code 1 or 2, which comprises these alternative procedures, it would be considered — it would be listed in the reconciled section. But because we don't know what those alternative procedures are, and they may or may not be directly reconciled back to a supporting document but rather be subject to some judgment of the accountants, the notion of reconciled here, as I've testified to, would be meaningless to an individual account holder.  Q. Well, you're a CFA but you're not a CPA, right?  A. That's correct.  Q. And so you're not here today to offer opinions about what would be adequate reconciliation procedures, right?	2 3 4 01:55:52 5 6 7 8 9 01:56:08 10 11 12 13 14 01:56:27 15 16 17 18 19 01:56:47 20 21 22	first step. The second step is whether or not there's an error.  Q. All right. You rejected the conclusion that all but nine transactions had been reconciled because of your understanding of the standard required to reconcile a transaction; is that correct?  A. I don't know that I rejected or discounted the notion. It was reported here that it was reconciled. It was just my opinion that given the hurdle associated with not being able to be reconciled, that this doesn't hold any particular meaning to the individual account holder.  Q. Okay. As a statistician, though, if it's reported to you that all but nine out of almost 2,400 transactions was reconciled, in your mind you would still consider there to be a problem with missing data?  A. Well, this goes to how the error rates and the reconciliation process is determined, and statisticians, as with your clients, Dr. Scheuren and Dr. Hinkins, had input, they had involvement in the discussion of what was reconciled and what wasn't. So it matters because it then how one uses the result of that reconciliation activity is premised in part, in large part upon what the reconciliation means.  So as a statistician, I would view with great skepticism
2 3 4 01:53:05 5 6 7 8 9 01:53:18 10 11 12 13 14 01:53:36 15 16 17 18 19 01:53:55 20 21 22 23	A. Yes, it does.  Q. And on page 13 of the report, table 4, how did you evaluate the fact that the table indicates that all but nine out of 2,372 transactions had been reconciled?  A. This goes right back to the notion of the high, high hurdle to be considered unreconciled.  Q. I'm sorry?  A. It goes back to the high, high hurdle to be considered unreconciled. So here what it's saying is if it was accounting code 1 or 2, which comprises these alternative procedures, it would be considered it would be listed in the reconciled section. But because we don't know what those alternative procedures are, and they may or may not be directly reconciled back to a supporting document but rather be subject to some judgment of the accountants, the notion of reconciled here, as I've testified to, would be meaningless to an individual account holder.  Q. Well, you're a CFA but you're not a CPA, right?  A. That's correct.  Q. And so you're not here today to offer opinions about what would be adequate reconciliation procedures, right?  A. That's correct. My understanding is Mr. Pallais will be	01:55:52 5 6 7 8 9 01:56:08 10 11 12 13 14 01:56:27 15 16 17 18 19 01:56:47 20 21 22 23	first step. The second step is whether or not there's an error.  Q. All right. You rejected the conclusion that all but nine transactions had been reconciled because of your understanding of the standard required to reconcile a transaction; is that correct?  A. I don't know that I rejected or discounted the notion. It was reported here that it was reconciled. It was just my opinion that given the hurdle associated with not being able to be reconciled, that this doesn't hold any particular meaning to the individual account holder.  Q. Okay. As a statistician, though, if it's reported to you that all but nine out of almost 2,400 transactions was reconciled, in your mind you would still consider there to be a problem with missing data?  A. Well, this goes to how the error rates and the reconciliation process is determined, and statisticians, as with your clients, Dr. Scheuren and Dr. Hinkins, had input, they had involvement in the discussion of what was reconciled and what wasn't. So it matters because it then how one uses the result of that reconciliation activity is premised in part, in large part upon what the reconciliation means.  So as a statistician, I would view with great skepticism the information that all but nine were reconciled. At a minimum
2 3 4 01:53:05 5 6 7 8 9 01:53:18 10 11 12 13 14 01:53:36 15 16 17 18 19 01:53:55 20 21 22 23 24	A. Yes, it does.  Q. And on page 13 of the report, table 4, how did you evaluate the fact that the table indicates that all but nine out of 2,372 transactions had been reconciled?  A. This goes right back to the notion of the high, high hurdle to be considered unreconciled.  Q. I'm sorry?  A. It goes back to the high, high hurdle to be considered unreconciled. So here what it's saying is if it was accounting code 1 or 2, which comprises these alternative procedures, it would be considered — it would be listed in the reconciled section. But because we don't know what those alternative procedures are, and they may or may not be directly reconciled back to a supporting document but rather be subject to some judgment of the accountants, the notion of reconciled here, as I've testified to, would be meaningless to an individual account holder.  Q. Well, you're a CFA but you're not a CPA, right?  A. That's correct.  Q. And so you're not here today to offer opinions about what would be adequate reconciliation procedures, right?  A. That's correct. My understanding is Mr. Pallais will be doing that.	01:55:52 5 6 7 8 9 01:56:08 10 11 12 13 14 01:56:27 15 16 17 18 19 01:56:47 20 21 22 23 24	first step. The second step is whether or not there's an error.  Q. All right. You rejected the conclusion that all but nine transactions had been reconciled because of your understanding of the standard required to reconcile a transaction; is that correct?  A. I don't know that I rejected or discounted the notion. It was reported here that it was reconciled. It was just my opinion that given the hurdle associated with not being able to be reconciled, that this doesn't hold any particular meaning to the individual account holder.  Q. Okay. As a statistician, though, if it's reported to you that all but nine out of almost 2,400 transactions was reconciled, in your mind you would still consider there to be a problem with missing data?  A. Well, this goes to how the error rates and the reconciliation process is determined, and statisticians, as with your clients, Dr. Scheuren and Dr. Hinkins, had input, they had involvement in the discussion of what was reconciled and what wasn't. So it matters because it then how one uses the result of that reconciliation activity is premised in part, in large part upon what the reconciliation means.  So as a statistician, I would view with great skepticism the information that all but nine were reconciled with a directly
2 3 4 01:53:05 5 6 7 8 9 01:53:18 10 11 12 13 14 01:53:36 15 16 17 18 19 01:53:55 20 21 22 23 24	A. Yes, it does.  Q. And on page 13 of the report, table 4, how did you evaluate the fact that the table indicates that all but nine out of 2,372 transactions had been reconciled?  A. This goes right back to the notion of the high, high hurdle to be considered unreconciled.  Q. I'm sorry?  A. It goes back to the high, high hurdle to be considered unreconciled. So here what it's saying is if it was accounting code 1 or 2, which comprises these alternative procedures, it would be considered it would be listed in the reconciled section. But because we don't know what those alternative procedures are, and they may or may not be directly reconciled back to a supporting document but rather be subject to some judgment of the accountants, the notion of reconciled here, as I've testified to, would be meaningless to an individual account holder.  Q. Well, you're a CFA but you're not a CPA, right?  A. That's correct.  Q. And so you're not here today to offer opinions about what would be adequate reconciliation procedures, right?  A. That's correct. My understanding is Mr. Pallais will be doing that.  Q. You talked about not knowing what alternative procedures	01:55:52 5 6 7 8 9 01:56:08 10 11 12 13 14 01:56:27 15 16 17 18 19 01:56:47 20 21 22 23 24	first step. The second step is whether or not there's an error.  Q. All right. You rejected the conclusion that all but nine transactions had been reconciled because of your understanding of the standard required to reconcile a transaction; is that correct?  A. I don't know that I rejected or discounted the notion. It was reported here that it was reconciled. It was just my opinion that given the hurdle associated with not being able to be reconciled, that this doesn't hold any particular meaning to the individual account holder.  Q. Okay. As a statistician, though, if it's reported to you that all but nine out of almost 2,400 transactions was reconciled, in your mind you would still consider there to be a problem with missing data?  A. Well, this goes to how the error rates and the reconciliation process is determined, and statisticians, as with your clients, Dr. Scheuren and Dr. Hinkins, had input, they had involvement in the discussion of what was reconciled and what wasn't. So it matters because it then how one uses the result of that reconciliation activity is premised in part, in large part upon what the reconciliation means.  So as a statistician, I would view with great skepticism the information that all but nine were reconciled. At a minimum I would like to know how many were reconciled by this

Page 1484 to 1487 of 1533

10/22/2007 09:13:37 PM

21 of 33 sheets

	1488		1490
1	recomputation method, and how did that work. How many were	1	data?
2	reconciled by third-party documentation. How many of these were	2	A. That's correct. Although here there are more differences
3	reconciled with the alternative procedures, and how was that	3	noted, but the same concept applies.
4	alternative procedure actually done.	4	Q. In this case by the way, you remember what Dr. Scheuren,
01:57:21 <b>5</b>	Then I would be able to take this information and make some	02:13:04 <b>5</b>	what NORC did for those instances where they couldn't find
6	kind of meaningful extrapolation up to the rest of the	6	support for a transaction?
7	population from which I drew the sample.	7	A. Well, you have to be more specific. What do you mean? In
8	Q. And in the course of your rendering your opinions rejecting	8	which calculation?
9	these findings, you never reviewed any of the materials used by	9	Q. I will. Why don't you go back let's jump back, I'm
01:57:36 10	the accountants to reconcile transactions, did you?	02:13:24 10	sorry, in the debit transactions. Okay. It's in the inferences
11	A. No, that's not correct. I've testified repeatedly I looked	11	for debit transactions. Do you remember reading this section,
12	at the accounting standard manual, which is the all the	12	inferences for debit transactions?
13	different versions we were provided, there were at least two or	13	A. Yes.
14	three we looked at because it's changed over time, but we looked	14	Q. Does that refresh your recollection as to how Dr. Scheuren
01:57:53 15	at the accounting standard manuals, and we looked at all the	02:13:59 15	and the NORC team treated the debit transactions where they
16	information we did have, which was the Eastern Region study, but	16	weren't able to reconcile them?
17	we were not provided as part of the administrative record with	17	A. Again, there's still the same two questions: How was it
18	any of the actual source documentation where you specifically	18	treated from the attribute standpoint and how it was treated
19	tied one transaction back to another.	19	from the variable standpoint. From the attribute standpoint it
01:58:06 <b>20</b>	Q. And that's what I meant by my question. You never looked	02:14:16 <b>20</b>	was treated as an error, for the calculation of it being a
21	at any of the stuff the auditors or the accountants actually	21	yes/no, was it an error. But for purposes of calculating it for
22	looked at in concluding that a transaction was reconciled,	22	the variable, the dollar amount of the error, since it was
23	right?	23	unreconciled, there was no information available, and the NORC
24	A. I looked for it and I didn't find it.	24	report assumed that that dollar difference was zero.
01:58:22 <b>25</b>	Q. Just to move it along oh, I'm getting a time-out sign.	02:14:32 <b>25</b>	So it's some of both. It's an assumption about what the
	Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR		Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
	Official Court Reporter		Official Court Reporter
	1489		1491
1	THE COURT: We'll take a 10-minute break.	1	error rate is, it was treated like an error. For the dollar
2	(Recess from 3:42 p.m. to 3:56 p.m.)	2	difference, it was not.
3	MR. WARSHAWSKY: Your Honor, just from a planning	3	<b>Q.</b> And what's the basis for your conclusion that that's how
4	point of view, counsel were talking over the break. Does the	4	they treated it for the variable analysis?
02:11:42 <b>5</b>	Court have a 4:30 matter, or is that gone?	02:14:44 <b>5</b>	A. I'd have to go back and look at the documents. It's in
6	THE COURT: We do but they're going to wait.	6	some of the detailed NORC reports, where they say there's a
7	MR. WARSHAWSKY: Excellent. Let's see if we can get	7	couple of different ways we can deal with this when we don't
8	through Mr. Duncan, then. Maybe you'll get your flight after	8	have information on the reconciliation. We could treat it as
9	all.	9	the average dollar error for the reconciled transactions, where
02:11:57 10	THE WITNESS: I was just telling His Honor thank you.	02:15:03 10	there was an error, we could take that average dollar amount, or
11	BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:	11	we could treat it as a zero. And they've effectively treated it
12	<b>Q.</b> Just jumping back to one subject, you read Ms. Herman's	12	as a zero.
13	testimony?	13	<b>Q.</b> Are you talking about some of those draft documents and
14	A. I did.	14	some of those documents prepared, say like in the 2002, 2003
02:12:08 15	Q. You recall her testimony about the Plaintiffs being	02:15:18 15	time frame?
16	provided copies of the IRMS data in 1997?	16	A. I'd have to go back and look specifically where that was
17	A. I do recall that.	17	at.
18	Q. In the course of your work, did you ever consider analyzing	18	Q. You don't sitting here today remember any analysis done in
19	the data that was provided to the Plaintiffs?	19	2005 that treated the unreconciled items as being not errors for
02:12:21 <b>20 21</b>	A. No, I have not.	02:15:34 <b>20 21</b>	purposes of the variable analysis, do you?
21	Q. Now, let's go back to AR-438. Page 16, table 7. Do you	21	A. Again, I'd have to go back and look at what date that
22	remember I was asking you before the break about the debit	22	document was.
23	transactions. I guess to shortcut it, credit transactions I	23	Q. And similarly, we can go to it by the way, Dr. Scheuren
02:12:48 <b>25</b>	gather you would draw a comparable conclusion with regard to the ability to reconcile the items in the national sample, missing	02:15:51 25	says that, in the final paragraph up here, that the error rates that he calculated, that those are based on a very conservative
02.12.40	Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR	02.10.01	Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
	Official Court Reporter		Official Court Reporter
10/22/2007	09:13:37 PM Page 1488 to	1491 of 153	·

	1492		1494
1	estimate, treating them as unreconciled, right?	1	goes ahead and performs the remaining work with regard to
2	A. For purposes of the attribute piece, yes.	2	posting transactions, land to dollars, the DCV work, that it's
3	Q. It's about as conservative as you could be, right?	3	not possible to draw valid statistical inferences about the
4	A. No. I think Dr. Scheuren or Dr. Hinkins appropriately	4	entire population here, are you?
02:16:11 5		02:19:20 <b>5</b>	A. Well, you would need to make sure that we don't have
6	·	6	missing and omitted transactions. And based on my review of th
7		7	documents, that is a hurdle that will not be cleared. As Arthur
8		8	Andersen opined, as the GAO opined, doing that kind of
9	• • • •	9	reconciliation would not be possible given the paucity of
2:16:29 10		02:19:40 10	documents.
11		11	Q. Well, I understand that's your assumption. That's what
12		12	you're working from. My question for you, sir, is if Interior
13	,	13	does go ahead and performs the remaining work to be done which
14		14	
2:16:40		02:19:54 15	is described in the plan and this is in the administrative
2:16:40 13	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	16	record if you want to look at it, we could pull that up, at pages 17, 18 AR5-66. Do you want us to do that?
17	3	17	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
18		18	A. We certainly could, but what you would need to see is the
	, , , ,	_	results of those, just as we've now, in 2007, have seen the
19		19	results of the sampling, you'd need to see the results of those
2:17:09 20	,	02:20:13 20	activities to opine whether or not it can be extrapolated to the
21	transactions were calculated?	21	target population of all trust beneficiaries for all funds in
22	-	22	transactions and account balances.
23		23	<b>Q.</b> And at this point in time you are just not in a position to
24		24	tell Judge Robertson anything about those results because they
2:17:24 <b>25</b>	• •	02:20:27 <b>25</b>	haven't happened yet, right?
	Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR		Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
	Official Court Reporter		Official Court Reporter
1	1493	1	1495
2	These are errors.	2	A. Well, I'm in a position to tell him that, in the first
3		3	instance, you're not going to be able to get to account
4		4	balances. It doesn't matter how much more sampling you do,
_	that?	4	you're sampling transactions, so you're not going to be able to
2:17:35	A .v 1		
		02:20:39 5	get to when I read the 2007 Plan it's clear to me, it says
6	<b>Q.</b> Does that refresh your recollection as to how the NORC	6	get to when I read the 2007 Plan it's clear to me, it says there would be accuracy and completeness with respect to the
6 7	<b>Q.</b> Does that refresh your recollection as to how the NORC analysis treated unreconciled credit transactions?	6 7	get to when I read the 2007 Plan it's clear to me, it says there would be accuracy and completeness with respect to the account transaction listings and the account balances as of
6 7 8	<ul> <li>Q. Does that refresh your recollection as to how the NORC analysis treated unreconciled credit transactions?</li> <li>A. No, it doesn't tell you anything about what if there was</li> </ul>	6 7 8	get to when I read the 2007 Plan it's clear to me, it says there would be accuracy and completeness with respect to the account transaction listings and the account balances as of 12/31/2000. So any extrapolation out to that population at the
6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q. Does that refresh your recollection as to how the NORC analysis treated unreconciled credit transactions?</li> <li>A. No, it doesn't tell you anything about what if there was a difference, what that difference was. And on an unreconciled</li> </ul>	6 7 8 9	get to when I read the 2007 Plan it's clear to me, it says there would be accuracy and completeness with respect to the account transaction listings and the account balances as of 12/31/2000. So any extrapolation out to that population at the end of the day is not going to be supported by what I've read in
6 7 8 9 2:17:58	<ul> <li>Q. Does that refresh your recollection as to how the NORC analysis treated unreconciled credit transactions?</li> <li>A. No, it doesn't tell you anything about what if there was a difference, what that difference was. And on an unreconciled transaction, it would be unclear to me what basis they would</li> </ul>	6 7 8 9 02:20:57 10	get to when I read the 2007 Plan it's clear to me, it says there would be accuracy and completeness with respect to the account transaction listings and the account balances as of 12/31/2000. So any extrapolation out to that population at the end of the day is not going to be supported by what I've read in the 2007 Plan.
6 7 8 9 2:17:58 10 11	<ul> <li>Q. Does that refresh your recollection as to how the NORC analysis treated unreconciled credit transactions?</li> <li>A. No, it doesn't tell you anything about what if there was a difference, what that difference was. And on an unreconciled transaction, it would be unclear to me what basis they would have for what that difference was. It's not been reconciled.</li> </ul>	6 7 8 9 02:20:57 10 11	get to when I read the 2007 Plan it's clear to me, it says there would be accuracy and completeness with respect to the account transaction listings and the account balances as of 12/31/2000. So any extrapolation out to that population at the end of the day is not going to be supported by what I've read in the 2007 Plan.  Q. Okay. I think we're talking about a different point now,
6 7 8 9 2:17:58 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Q. Does that refresh your recollection as to how the NORC analysis treated unreconciled credit transactions?</li> <li>A. No, it doesn't tell you anything about what if there was a difference, what that difference was. And on an unreconciled transaction, it would be unclear to me what basis they would have for what that difference was. It's not been reconciled.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Let's go back to your expert report, second bullet</li> </ul>	6 7 8 9 02:20:57 10 11 12	get to when I read the 2007 Plan it's clear to me, it says there would be accuracy and completeness with respect to the account transaction listings and the account balances as of 12/31/2000. So any extrapolation out to that population at the end of the day is not going to be supported by what I've read in the 2007 Plan.
6 7 8 9 2:17:58 10 11 12	<ul> <li>Q. Does that refresh your recollection as to how the NORC analysis treated unreconciled credit transactions?</li> <li>A. No, it doesn't tell you anything about what if there was a difference, what that difference was. And on an unreconciled transaction, it would be unclear to me what basis they would have for what that difference was. It's not been reconciled.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Let's go back to your expert report, second bullet point on page 5, please. Why don't you blow that up. This is</li> </ul>	6 7 8 9 02:20:57 10 11 12 13	get to when I read the 2007 Plan it's clear to me, it says there would be accuracy and completeness with respect to the account transaction listings and the account balances as of 12/31/2000. So any extrapolation out to that population at the end of the day is not going to be supported by what I've read in the 2007 Plan.  Q. Okay. I think we're talking about a different point now,
6 7 8 9 10:17:58 10 11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q. Does that refresh your recollection as to how the NORC analysis treated unreconciled credit transactions?</li> <li>A. No, it doesn't tell you anything about what if there was a difference, what that difference was. And on an unreconciled transaction, it would be unclear to me what basis they would have for what that difference was. It's not been reconciled.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Let's go back to your expert report, second bullet point on page 5, please. Why don't you blow that up. This is the one, do you see that, about the sampled population is</li> </ul>	6 7 8 9 02:20:57 10 11 12 13 14	get to when I read the 2007 Plan it's clear to me, it says there would be accuracy and completeness with respect to the account transaction listings and the account balances as of 12/31/2000. So any extrapolation out to that population at the end of the day is not going to be supported by what I've read in the 2007 Plan.  Q. Okay. I think we're talking about a different point now, and we'll get to the account balances and the transactions
6 7 8 9 2:17:58 10 11 12 13 14 2:18:28	<ul> <li>Q. Does that refresh your recollection as to how the NORC analysis treated unreconciled credit transactions?</li> <li>A. No, it doesn't tell you anything about what if there was a difference, what that difference was. And on an unreconciled transaction, it would be unclear to me what basis they would have for what that difference was. It's not been reconciled.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Let's go back to your expert report, second bullet point on page 5, please. Why don't you blow that up. This is the one, do you see that, about the sampled population is different from the target population?</li> </ul>	6 7 8 9 02:20:57 10 11 12 13	get to when I read the 2007 Plan it's clear to me, it says there would be accuracy and completeness with respect to the account transaction listings and the account balances as of 12/31/2000. So any extrapolation out to that population at the end of the day is not going to be supported by what I've read in the 2007 Plan.  Q. Okay. I think we're talking about a different point now, and we'll get to the account balances and the transactions issues that you testified about. But let's move to the third
6 7 8 9 2:17:58 10 11 12 13 14 2:18:28 15	<ul> <li>Q. Does that refresh your recollection as to how the NORC analysis treated unreconciled credit transactions?</li> <li>A. No, it doesn't tell you anything about what if there was a difference, what that difference was. And on an unreconciled transaction, it would be unclear to me what basis they would have for what that difference was. It's not been reconciled.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Let's go back to your expert report, second bullet point on page 5, please. Why don't you blow that up. This is the one, do you see that, about the sampled population is different from the target population?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>	6 7 8 9 02:20:57 10 11 12 13 14 02:21:15 15	get to when I read the 2007 Plan it's clear to me, it says there would be accuracy and completeness with respect to the account transaction listings and the account balances as of 12/31/2000. So any extrapolation out to that population at the end of the day is not going to be supported by what I've read in the 2007 Plan.  Q. Okay. I think we're talking about a different point now, and we'll get to the account balances and the transactions issues that you testified about. But let's move to the third bullet point here. You talked about estimating litigation
6 7 8 9 2:17:58 10 11 12 13 14 2:18:28 15 16	<ul> <li>Q. Does that refresh your recollection as to how the NORC analysis treated unreconciled credit transactions?</li> <li>A. No, it doesn't tell you anything about what if there was a difference, what that difference was. And on an unreconciled transaction, it would be unclear to me what basis they would have for what that difference was. It's not been reconciled.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Let's go back to your expert report, second bullet point on page 5, please. Why don't you blow that up. This is the one, do you see that, about the sampled population is different from the target population?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And you say that the plan to sample the target population</li> </ul>	6 7 8 9 02:20:57 10 11 12 13 14 02:21:15 15	get to when I read the 2007 Plan it's clear to me, it says there would be accuracy and completeness with respect to the account transaction listings and the account balances as of 12/31/2000. So any extrapolation out to that population at the end of the day is not going to be supported by what I've read in the 2007 Plan.  Q. Okay. I think we're talking about a different point now, and we'll get to the account balances and the transactions issues that you testified about. But let's move to the third bullet point here. You talked about estimating litigation exposure, and I'm going to be real quick on this one. You've
6 7 8 9 2:17:58 10 11 12 13 14 2:18:28 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Q. Does that refresh your recollection as to how the NORC analysis treated unreconciled credit transactions?</li> <li>A. No, it doesn't tell you anything about what if there was a difference, what that difference was. And on an unreconciled transaction, it would be unclear to me what basis they would have for what that difference was. It's not been reconciled.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Let's go back to your expert report, second bullet point on page 5, please. Why don't you blow that up. This is the one, do you see that, about the sampled population is different from the target population?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And you say that the plan to sample the target population is conjecture, not statistical inference. Does your analysis</li> </ul>	6 7 8 9 02:20:57 10 11 12 13 14 02:21:15 15 16 17 18	get to when I read the 2007 Plan it's clear to me, it says there would be accuracy and completeness with respect to the account transaction listings and the account balances as of 12/31/2000. So any extrapolation out to that population at the end of the day is not going to be supported by what I've read in the 2007 Plan.  Q. Okay. I think we're talking about a different point now, and we'll get to the account balances and the transactions issues that you testified about. But let's move to the third bullet point here. You talked about estimating litigation exposure, and I'm going to be real quick on this one. You've read Dr. Hinkins' rebuttal to your opinion on that, right?
6 7 8 9 2:17:58 10 11 12 13 14 2:18:28 15 16	<ul> <li>Q. Does that refresh your recollection as to how the NORC analysis treated unreconciled credit transactions?</li> <li>A. No, it doesn't tell you anything about what if there was a difference, what that difference was. And on an unreconciled transaction, it would be unclear to me what basis they would have for what that difference was. It's not been reconciled.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Let's go back to your expert report, second bullet point on page 5, please. Why don't you blow that up. This is the one, do you see that, about the sampled population is different from the target population?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And you say that the plan to sample the target population is conjecture, not statistical inference. Does your analysis</li> </ul>	6 7 8 9 02:20:57 10 11 12 13 14 02:21:15 15 16	get to when I read the 2007 Plan it's clear to me, it says there would be accuracy and completeness with respect to the account transaction listings and the account balances as of 12/31/2000. So any extrapolation out to that population at the end of the day is not going to be supported by what I've read in the 2007 Plan.  Q. Okay. I think we're talking about a different point now, and we'll get to the account balances and the transactions issues that you testified about. But let's move to the third bullet point here. You talked about estimating litigation exposure, and I'm going to be real quick on this one. You've read Dr. Hinkins' rebuttal to your opinion on that, right?  A. I have.
6 7 8 9 2:17:58 10 11 12 13 14 2:18:28 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q. Does that refresh your recollection as to how the NORC analysis treated unreconciled credit transactions?</li> <li>A. No, it doesn't tell you anything about what if there was a difference, what that difference was. And on an unreconciled transaction, it would be unclear to me what basis they would have for what that difference was. It's not been reconciled.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Let's go back to your expert report, second bullet point on page 5, please. Why don't you blow that up. This is the one, do you see that, about the sampled population is different from the target population?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And you say that the plan to sample the target population is conjecture, not statistical inference. Does your analysis also take into consideration the work that the plan describes to</li> </ul>	6 7 8 9 02:20:57 10 11 12 13 14 02:21:15 15 16 17 18	get to when I read the 2007 Plan it's clear to me, it says there would be accuracy and completeness with respect to the account transaction listings and the account balances as of 12/31/2000. So any extrapolation out to that population at the end of the day is not going to be supported by what I've read in the 2007 Plan.  Q. Okay. I think we're talking about a different point now, and we'll get to the account balances and the transactions issues that you testified about. But let's move to the third bullet point here. You talked about estimating litigation exposure, and I'm going to be real quick on this one. You've read Dr. Hinkins' rebuttal to your opinion on that, right?  A. I have.  Q. And she says you're just flat out wrong, right?
6 7 8 9 2:17:58 10 11 12 13 14 2:18:28 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q. Does that refresh your recollection as to how the NORC analysis treated unreconciled credit transactions?</li> <li>A. No, it doesn't tell you anything about what if there was a difference, what that difference was. And on an unreconciled transaction, it would be unclear to me what basis they would have for what that difference was. It's not been reconciled.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Let's go back to your expert report, second bullet point on page 5, please. Why don't you blow that up. This is the one, do you see that, about the sampled population is different from the target population?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And you say that the plan to sample the target population is conjecture, not statistical inference. Does your analysis also take into consideration the work that the plan describes to</li> </ul>	6 7 8 9 02:20:57 10 11 12 13 14 02:21:15 15 16 17 18 19	get to when I read the 2007 Plan it's clear to me, it says there would be accuracy and completeness with respect to the account transaction listings and the account balances as of 12/31/2000. So any extrapolation out to that population at the end of the day is not going to be supported by what I've read in the 2007 Plan.  Q. Okay. I think we're talking about a different point now, and we'll get to the account balances and the transactions issues that you testified about. But let's move to the third bullet point here. You talked about estimating litigation exposure, and I'm going to be real quick on this one. You've read Dr. Hinkins' rebuttal to your opinion on that, right?  A. I have.  Q. And she says you're just flat out wrong, right?  A. Well, she's of the opinion that it was estimated to do what
6 7 8 9 2:17:58 10 11 12 13 14 2:18:28 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Q. Does that refresh your recollection as to how the NORC analysis treated unreconciled credit transactions?</li> <li>A. No, it doesn't tell you anything about what if there was a difference, what that difference was. And on an unreconciled transaction, it would be unclear to me what basis they would have for what that difference was. It's not been reconciled.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Let's go back to your expert report, second bullet point on page 5, please. Why don't you blow that up. This is the one, do you see that, about the sampled population is different from the target population?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And you say that the plan to sample the target population is conjecture, not statistical inference. Does your analysis also take into consideration the work that the plan describes to be completed with regard to things such as the DCV, the land-to-dollars work, posting tests?</li> </ul>	6 7 8 9 02:20:57 10 11 12 13 14 02:21:15 15 16 17 18 19 02:21:33 20	get to when I read the 2007 Plan it's clear to me, it says there would be accuracy and completeness with respect to the account transaction listings and the account balances as of 12/31/2000. So any extrapolation out to that population at the end of the day is not going to be supported by what I've read in the 2007 Plan.  Q. Okay. I think we're talking about a different point now, and we'll get to the account balances and the transactions issues that you testified about. But let's move to the third bullet point here. You talked about estimating litigation exposure, and I'm going to be real quick on this one. You've read Dr. Hinkins' rebuttal to your opinion on that, right?  A. I have.  Q. And she says you're just flat out wrong, right?  A. Well, she's of the opinion that it was estimated to do what it did, which is to make an extrapolation to the sliver of the
2:17:58 10 11 12 13 14 2:18:28 15 16 17 18 19 2:18:45 20 21	<ul> <li>Q. Does that refresh your recollection as to how the NORC analysis treated unreconciled credit transactions?</li> <li>A. No, it doesn't tell you anything about what if there was a difference, what that difference was. And on an unreconciled transaction, it would be unclear to me what basis they would have for what that difference was. It's not been reconciled.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Let's go back to your expert report, second bullet point on page 5, please. Why don't you blow that up. This is the one, do you see that, about the sampled population is different from the target population?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And you say that the plan to sample the target population is conjecture, not statistical inference. Does your analysis also take into consideration the work that the plan describes to be completed with regard to things such as the DCV, the land-to-dollars work, posting tests?</li> <li>A. No, this specifically looks at the sampled population,</li> </ul>	6 7 8 9 02:20:57 10 11 12 13 14 02:21:15 15 16 17 18 19 02:21:33 20 21	get to when I read the 2007 Plan it's clear to me, it says there would be accuracy and completeness with respect to the account transaction listings and the account balances as of 12/31/2000. So any extrapolation out to that population at the end of the day is not going to be supported by what I've read in the 2007 Plan.  Q. Okay. I think we're talking about a different point now, and we'll get to the account balances and the transactions issues that you testified about. But let's move to the third bullet point here. You talked about estimating litigation exposure, and I'm going to be real quick on this one. You've read Dr. Hinkins' rebuttal to your opinion on that, right?  A. I have.  Q. And she says you're just flat out wrong, right?  A. Well, she's of the opinion that it was estimated to do what it did, which is to make an extrapolation to the sliver of the electronic ledger from which they sampled. So we're obviously
2:17:58 10 11 12 13 14 2:18:28 15 16 17 18 19 2:18:45 20 21	<ul> <li>Q. Does that refresh your recollection as to how the NORC analysis treated unreconciled credit transactions?</li> <li>A. No, it doesn't tell you anything about what if there was a difference, what that difference was. And on an unreconciled transaction, it would be unclear to me what basis they would have for what that difference was. It's not been reconciled.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Let's go back to your expert report, second bullet point on page 5, please. Why don't you blow that up. This is the one, do you see that, about the sampled population is different from the target population?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And you say that the plan to sample the target population is conjecture, not statistical inference. Does your analysis also take into consideration the work that the plan describes to be completed with regard to things such as the DCV, the land-to-dollars work, posting tests?</li> <li>A. No, this specifically looks at the sampled population, which was the subject of the sampling that was done, cannot be</li> </ul>	6 7 8 9 02:20:57 10 11 12 13 14 02:21:15 15 16 17 18 19 02:21:33 20 21 22	get to when I read the 2007 Plan it's clear to me, it says there would be accuracy and completeness with respect to the account transaction listings and the account balances as of 12/31/2000. So any extrapolation out to that population at the end of the day is not going to be supported by what I've read in the 2007 Plan.  Q. Okay. I think we're talking about a different point now, and we'll get to the account balances and the transactions issues that you testified about. But let's move to the third bullet point here. You talked about estimating litigation exposure, and I'm going to be real quick on this one. You've read Dr. Hinkins' rebuttal to your opinion on that, right?  A. I have.  Q. And she says you're just flat out wrong, right?  A. Well, she's of the opinion that it was estimated to do what it did, which is to make an extrapolation to the sliver of the electronic ledger from which they sampled. So we're obviously in disagreement on this point as to what it was designed for,
2:17:58 10 11 12 13 14 2:18:28 15 16 17 18 19 2:18:45 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Q. Does that refresh your recollection as to how the NORC analysis treated unreconciled credit transactions?</li> <li>A. No, it doesn't tell you anything about what if there was a difference, what that difference was. And on an unreconciled transaction, it would be unclear to me what basis they would have for what that difference was. It's not been reconciled.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Let's go back to your expert report, second bullet point on page 5, please. Why don't you blow that up. This is the one, do you see that, about the sampled population is different from the target population?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And you say that the plan to sample the target population is conjecture, not statistical inference. Does your analysis also take into consideration the work that the plan describes to be completed with regard to things such as the DCV, the land-to-dollars work, posting tests?</li> <li>A. No, this specifically looks at the sampled population, which was the subject of the sampling that was done, cannot be inferred beyond the target population from which it was drawn.</li> </ul>	6 7 8 9 02:20:57 10 11 12 13 14 02:21:15 15 16 17 18 19 02:21:33 20 21 22 23	get to when I read the 2007 Plan it's clear to me, it says there would be accuracy and completeness with respect to the account transaction listings and the account balances as of 12/31/2000. So any extrapolation out to that population at the end of the day is not going to be supported by what I've read in the 2007 Plan.  Q. Okay. I think we're talking about a different point now, and we'll get to the account balances and the transactions issues that you testified about. But let's move to the third bullet point here. You talked about estimating litigation exposure, and I'm going to be real quick on this one. You've read Dr. Hinkins' rebuttal to your opinion on that, right?  A. I have.  Q. And she says you're just flat out wrong, right?  A. Well, she's of the opinion that it was estimated to do what it did, which is to make an extrapolation to the sliver of the electronic ledger from which they sampled. So we're obviously in disagreement on this point as to what it was designed for, but the notion of what the dollar exposure is was not only
2:17:58 10 11 12 13 14 2:18:28 15 16 17 18 19 2:18:45 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. Does that refresh your recollection as to how the NORC analysis treated unreconciled credit transactions?</li> <li>A. No, it doesn't tell you anything about what if there was a difference, what that difference was. And on an unreconciled transaction, it would be unclear to me what basis they would have for what that difference was. It's not been reconciled.</li> <li>Q. Okay. Let's go back to your expert report, second bullet point on page 5, please. Why don't you blow that up. This is the one, do you see that, about the sampled population is different from the target population?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. And you say that the plan to sample the target population is conjecture, not statistical inference. Does your analysis also take into consideration the work that the plan describes to be completed with regard to things such as the DCV, the land-to-dollars work, posting tests?</li> <li>A. No, this specifically looks at the sampled population, which was the subject of the sampling that was done, cannot be inferred beyond the target population from which it was drawn.</li> </ul>	6 7 8 9 02:20:57 10 11 12 13 14 02:21:15 15 16 17 18 19 02:21:33 20 21 22 23 24	get to when I read the 2007 Plan it's clear to me, it says there would be accuracy and completeness with respect to the account transaction listings and the account balances as of 12/31/2000. So any extrapolation out to that population at the end of the day is not going to be supported by what I've read in the 2007 Plan.  Q. Okay. I think we're talking about a different point now, and we'll get to the account balances and the transactions issues that you testified about. But let's move to the third bullet point here. You talked about estimating litigation exposure, and I'm going to be real quick on this one. You've read Dr. Hinkins' rebuttal to your opinion on that, right?  A. I have.  Q. And she says you're just flat out wrong, right?  A. Well, she's of the opinion that it was estimated to do what it did, which is to make an extrapolation to the sliver of the electronic ledger from which they sampled. So we're obviously in disagreement on this point as to what it was designed for, but the notion of what the dollar exposure is was not only testified to by Dr. Scheuren but was also specifically in the

	1496		1498
1	exposure on credits. \$8 million in exposure on debits. That's	1	result of a probate transaction, I mean that's a transaction
2	exactly the language, so	2	that creates the opening balance in the account, right?
3	Q. I think it was 4 on debits, right?	3	A. That would do that, yes.
4	A. 4 million on debits. I stand corrected. So those issues,	4	Q. Okay.
02:22:13 <b>5</b>	the concept is unchanged that there's this notion of what the	02:25:04 <b>5</b>	A. Potentially. I guess if they didn't have another account,
6	exposure is. The exercise that was done does identify the	6	then yes, a probate transaction could create a separate account.
7	exposure during the electronic ledger era in total, but it's not	7	Q. Okay. So that's one way that you could be looking at the
8	going to give information to the account holders about their	8	accuracy of what the opening balance is, you look at the
9	account balances.	9	transaction that establishes the opening balance, right?
02:22:23 10	Q. Well, specifically, I'm talking about your analysis, and	02:25:20 10	A. That would be one way.
11	it's in 4.3.3.1, which you reference in this bullet point. We	11	Q. Okay. Now, in your report, you stated, and you testified
12	can go there if you need. But you talked about the netting of	12	about this earlier, that Interior was aware of the issue about
13	transactions, netting of overpayments and underpayments, right?	13	sampling accounts, and you referred to this November 24, 2002,
14	A. Correct. As one specific illustration of this being a	14	memorandum. Do you recall that?
02:22:45 15	litigation exposure exercise, estimating the numbers in total,	02:25:38 15	A. Is that the OHTA memorandum?
16	rather than an analysis, as I've said here, of the histories	16	Q. It is. Why don't we go ahead and pull that up. This is
17	transaction histories and account balances.	17	administrative record 264, Bates numbers 11-5. And you
18	Q. And in Dr. Hinkins' rebuttal to you she was pretty adamant	18	testified about this earlier today, right?
19	that was wrong, your assumption, right?	19	A. Yes, I did.
02:23:00 <b>20</b>	A. You mean the concept of netting.	02:26:00 <b>20</b>	Q. And specifically, you were referring to page 4. Let's go
21	Q. Right.	21	ahead to page 4, and blow up the second paragraph is what
22	A. She was adamant that NORC had not done netting, but as I	22	you're talking about. Why don't we get both paragraphs, the one
23	read her opinion, she didn't say that the 2007 Plan had not done	23	above as well. There we go.
24	netting.	24	Specifically, you focused on this statement about the
02:23:12 <b>25</b>	Q. Okay. Well, if your assumption about the netting of	02:26:28 <b>25</b>	account error rate could explode up to 30 percent, right?
	Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR		Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
	Official Court Reporter		Official Court Reporter
	1497		1499
1	overpayments and underpayments is incorrect, you'd agree with me	1	
	overpayments and underpayments is incorrect, you a agree with me	•	A. Correct.
2	your third bullet point is also incorrect here, right?	2	<ul><li>Q. And in your analysis, did you also consider the preceding</li></ul>
3			
3 4	your third bullet point is also incorrect here, right?  A. No, but that's only one piece of it. It's also what we've talked about, there not being an ability to talk about the	2 3 4	Q. And in your analysis, did you also consider the preceding paragraph, where the author of this draft and by the way, this was a draft document, wasn't it?
3 4 02:23:30 5	your third bullet point is also incorrect here, right?  A. No, but that's only one piece of it. It's also what we've talked about, there not being an ability to talk about the account balance.	2 3 4 02:26:43 5	<ul> <li>Q. And in your analysis, did you also consider the preceding paragraph, where the author of this draft and by the way, this was a draft document, wasn't it?</li> <li>A. I believe so.</li> </ul>
02:23:30 <b>5 6</b>	your third bullet point is also incorrect here, right?  A. No, but that's only one piece of it. It's also what we've talked about, there not being an ability to talk about the account balance.  Q. Now, the fourth bullet point, and you started talking about	2 3 4	<ul> <li>Q. And in your analysis, did you also consider the preceding paragraph, where the author of this draft and by the way, this was a draft document, wasn't it?</li> <li>A. I believe so.</li> <li>Q was noting the cost of doing a full reconciliation of</li> </ul>
3 4 02:23:30 5 6 7	your third bullet point is also incorrect here, right?  A. No, but that's only one piece of it. It's also what we've talked about, there not being an ability to talk about the account balance.  Q. Now, the fourth bullet point, and you started talking about this just a couple of answers ago, about the notion of sampling	2 3 4 02:26:43 5 6 7	<ul> <li>Q. And in your analysis, did you also consider the preceding paragraph, where the author of this draft and by the way, this was a draft document, wasn't it?</li> <li>A. I believe so.</li> <li>Q was noting the cost of doing a full reconciliation of accounts?</li> </ul>
3 4 02:23:30 5 6 7 8	your third bullet point is also incorrect here, right?  A. No, but that's only one piece of it. It's also what we've talked about, there not being an ability to talk about the account balance.  Q. Now, the fourth bullet point, and you started talking about this just a couple of answers ago, about the notion of sampling transactions instead of sampling account balances. Let me ask	2 3 4 02:26:43 5 6 7 8	<ul> <li>Q. And in your analysis, did you also consider the preceding paragraph, where the author of this draft and by the way, this was a draft document, wasn't it?</li> <li>A. I believe so.</li> <li>Q was noting the cost of doing a full reconciliation of accounts?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> </ul>
02:23:30 5 6 7 8 9	your third bullet point is also incorrect here, right?  A. No, but that's only one piece of it. It's also what we've talked about, there not being an ability to talk about the account balance.  Q. Now, the fourth bullet point, and you started talking about this just a couple of answers ago, about the notion of sampling transactions instead of sampling account balances. Let me ask if, from a basic point of view, as a financial person, you	2 3 4 02:26:43 5 6 7 8 9	<ul> <li>Q. And in your analysis, did you also consider the preceding paragraph, where the author of this draft and by the way, this was a draft document, wasn't it?</li> <li>A. I believe so.</li> <li>Q was noting the cost of doing a full reconciliation of accounts?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. In fact and you've talked about the paragraph 19</li> </ul>
02:23:30 5 6 7 8 9 02:23:53 10	your third bullet point is also incorrect here, right?  A. No, but that's only one piece of it. It's also what we've talked about, there not being an ability to talk about the account balance.  Q. Now, the fourth bullet point, and you started talking about this just a couple of answers ago, about the notion of sampling transactions instead of sampling account balances. Let me ask if, from a basic point of view, as a financial person, you understand of course that an account balance is the result of	2 3 4 02:26:43 5 6 7 8 9 02:26:57 10	<ul> <li>Q. And in your analysis, did you also consider the preceding paragraph, where the author of this draft and by the way, this was a draft document, wasn't it?</li> <li>A. I believe so.</li> <li>Q was noting the cost of doing a full reconciliation of accounts?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. In fact and you've talked about the paragraph 19 exercise a little bit, right?</li> </ul>
3 4 02:23:30 5 6 7 8 9 02:23:53 10	your third bullet point is also incorrect here, right?  A. No, but that's only one piece of it. It's also what we've talked about, there not being an ability to talk about the account balance.  Q. Now, the fourth bullet point, and you started talking about this just a couple of answers ago, about the notion of sampling transactions instead of sampling account balances. Let me ask if, from a basic point of view, as a financial person, you understand of course that an account balance is the result of the transactions, right? I mean, the sum of transactions going	2 3 4 02:26:43 5 6 7 8 9 02:26:57 10	<ul> <li>Q. And in your analysis, did you also consider the preceding paragraph, where the author of this draft and by the way, this was a draft document, wasn't it?</li> <li>A. I believe so.</li> <li>Q was noting the cost of doing a full reconciliation of accounts?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. In fact and you've talked about the paragraph 19 exercise a little bit, right?</li> <li>A. I did.</li> </ul>
3 4 02:23:30 5 6 7 8 9 02:23:53 10 11	your third bullet point is also incorrect here, right?  A. No, but that's only one piece of it. It's also what we've talked about, there not being an ability to talk about the account balance.  Q. Now, the fourth bullet point, and you started talking about this just a couple of answers ago, about the notion of sampling transactions instead of sampling account balances. Let me ask if, from a basic point of view, as a financial person, you understand of course that an account balance is the result of the transactions, right? I mean, the sum of transactions going in, reductions for transactions going out, right?	2 3 4 02:26:43 5 6 7 8 9 02:26:57 10 11	<ul> <li>Q. And in your analysis, did you also consider the preceding paragraph, where the author of this draft and by the way, this was a draft document, wasn't it?</li> <li>A. I believe so.</li> <li>Q was noting the cost of doing a full reconciliation of accounts?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. In fact and you've talked about the paragraph 19 exercise a little bit, right?</li> <li>A. I did.</li> <li>Q. And you know that was an extremely expensive process.</li> </ul>
02:23:30 5 6 7 8 9 02:23:53 10 11 12 13	your third bullet point is also incorrect here, right?  A. No, but that's only one piece of it. It's also what we've talked about, there not being an ability to talk about the account balance.  Q. Now, the fourth bullet point, and you started talking about this just a couple of answers ago, about the notion of sampling transactions instead of sampling account balances. Let me ask if, from a basic point of view, as a financial person, you understand of course that an account balance is the result of the transactions, right? I mean, the sum of transactions going in, reductions for transactions going out, right?  A. You can get there if you know the opening balance, yes.	2 3 4 02:26:43 5 6 7 8 9 02:26:57 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q. And in your analysis, did you also consider the preceding paragraph, where the author of this draft and by the way, this was a draft document, wasn't it?</li> <li>A. I believe so.</li> <li>Q was noting the cost of doing a full reconciliation of accounts?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. In fact and you've talked about the paragraph 19 exercise a little bit, right?</li> <li>A. I did.</li> <li>Q. And you know that was an extremely expensive process.</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> </ul>
02:23:30 5 6 7 8 9 02:23:53 10 11 12 13 14	your third bullet point is also incorrect here, right?  A. No, but that's only one piece of it. It's also what we've talked about, there not being an ability to talk about the account balance.  Q. Now, the fourth bullet point, and you started talking about this just a couple of answers ago, about the notion of sampling transactions instead of sampling account balances. Let me ask if, from a basic point of view, as a financial person, you understand of course that an account balance is the result of the transactions, right? I mean, the sum of transactions going in, reductions for transactions going out, right?  A. You can get there if you know the opening balance, yes. Then the transaction information will help you get to a closing	2 3 4 02:26:43 5 6 7 8 9 02:26:57 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q. And in your analysis, did you also consider the preceding paragraph, where the author of this draft and by the way, this was a draft document, wasn't it?</li> <li>A. I believe so.</li> <li>Q was noting the cost of doing a full reconciliation of accounts?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. In fact and you've talked about the paragraph 19 exercise a little bit, right?</li> <li>A. I did.</li> <li>Q. And you know that was an extremely expensive process.</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. To select an account and reconcile every single transaction</li> </ul>
02:23:30 5 6 7 7 8 9 9 02:23:53 10 11 12 13 14 02:24:10 15	your third bullet point is also incorrect here, right?  A. No, but that's only one piece of it. It's also what we've talked about, there not being an ability to talk about the account balance.  Q. Now, the fourth bullet point, and you started talking about this just a couple of answers ago, about the notion of sampling transactions instead of sampling account balances. Let me ask if, from a basic point of view, as a financial person, you understand of course that an account balance is the result of the transactions, right? I mean, the sum of transactions going in, reductions for transactions going out, right?  A. You can get there if you know the opening balance, yes. Then the transaction information will help you get to a closing balance.	2 3 4 02:26:43 5 6 7 8 9 02:26:57 10 11 12 13 14 02:27:09 15	<ul> <li>Q. And in your analysis, did you also consider the preceding paragraph, where the author of this draft and by the way, this was a draft document, wasn't it?</li> <li>A. I believe so.</li> <li>Q was noting the cost of doing a full reconciliation of accounts?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. In fact and you've talked about the paragraph 19 exercise a little bit, right?</li> <li>A. I did.</li> <li>Q. And you know that was an extremely expensive process.</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. To select an account and reconcile every single transaction in it, right?</li> </ul>
02:23:30 5 66 7 8 9 02:23:53 10 11 12 13 14 02:24:10 15	your third bullet point is also incorrect here, right?  A. No, but that's only one piece of it. It's also what we've talked about, there not being an ability to talk about the account balance.  Q. Now, the fourth bullet point, and you started talking about this just a couple of answers ago, about the notion of sampling transactions instead of sampling account balances. Let me ask if, from a basic point of view, as a financial person, you understand of course that an account balance is the result of the transactions, right? I mean, the sum of transactions going in, reductions for transactions going out, right?  A. You can get there if you know the opening balance, yes. Then the transaction information will help you get to a closing balance.  Q. Okay. And in fact, isn't it true maybe you don't know	2 3 4 02:26:43 5 6 7 8 9 02:26:57 10 11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q. And in your analysis, did you also consider the preceding paragraph, where the author of this draft and by the way, this was a draft document, wasn't it?</li> <li>A. I believe so.</li> <li>Q was noting the cost of doing a full reconciliation of accounts?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. In fact and you've talked about the paragraph 19 exercise a little bit, right?</li> <li>A. I did.</li> <li>Q. And you know that was an extremely expensive process.</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. To select an account and reconcile every single transaction in it, right?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> </ul>
02:23:30 5 6 7 8 9 02:23:53 10 11 12 13 14 02:24:10 15 16 17	your third bullet point is also incorrect here, right?  A. No, but that's only one piece of it. It's also what we've talked about, there not being an ability to talk about the account balance.  Q. Now, the fourth bullet point, and you started talking about this just a couple of answers ago, about the notion of sampling transactions instead of sampling account balances. Let me ask if, from a basic point of view, as a financial person, you understand of course that an account balance is the result of the transactions, right? I mean, the sum of transactions going in, reductions for transactions going out, right?  A. You can get there if you know the opening balance, yes. Then the transaction information will help you get to a closing balance.  Q. Okay. And in fact, isn't it true maybe you don't know this, I don't know, but from your dealings with accountants,	2 3 4 02:26:43 5 6 7 8 9 02:26:57 10 11 12 13 14 02:27:09 15 16	<ul> <li>Q. And in your analysis, did you also consider the preceding paragraph, where the author of this draft and by the way, this was a draft document, wasn't it?</li> <li>A. I believe so.</li> <li>Q was noting the cost of doing a full reconciliation of accounts?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. In fact and you've talked about the paragraph 19 exercise a little bit, right?</li> <li>A. I did.</li> <li>Q. And you know that was an extremely expensive process.</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. To select an account and reconcile every single transaction in it, right?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Isn't that the context of the statement here, that it</li> </ul>
02:23:30 5 66 7 8 9 02:23:53 10 11 12 13 14 02:24:10 15	your third bullet point is also incorrect here, right?  A. No, but that's only one piece of it. It's also what we've talked about, there not being an ability to talk about the account balance.  Q. Now, the fourth bullet point, and you started talking about this just a couple of answers ago, about the notion of sampling transactions instead of sampling account balances. Let me ask if, from a basic point of view, as a financial person, you understand of course that an account balance is the result of the transactions, right? I mean, the sum of transactions going in, reductions for transactions going out, right?  A. You can get there if you know the opening balance, yes. Then the transaction information will help you get to a closing balance.  Q. Okay. And in fact, isn't it true maybe you don't know	2 3 4 02:26:43 5 6 7 8 9 02:26:57 10 11 12 13 14 02:27:09 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Q. And in your analysis, did you also consider the preceding paragraph, where the author of this draft and by the way, this was a draft document, wasn't it?</li> <li>A. I believe so.</li> <li>Q was noting the cost of doing a full reconciliation of accounts?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. In fact and you've talked about the paragraph 19 exercise a little bit, right?</li> <li>A. I did.</li> <li>Q. And you know that was an extremely expensive process.</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. To select an account and reconcile every single transaction in it, right?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> </ul>
02:23:30 5 6 7 7 8 9 9 02:23:53 10 11 12 13 14 02:24:10 15 16 17 18 19	your third bullet point is also incorrect here, right?  A. No, but that's only one piece of it. It's also what we've talked about, there not being an ability to talk about the account balance.  Q. Now, the fourth bullet point, and you started talking about this just a couple of answers ago, about the notion of sampling transactions instead of sampling account balances. Let me ask if, from a basic point of view, as a financial person, you understand of course that an account balance is the result of the transactions, right? I mean, the sum of transactions going in, reductions for transactions going out, right?  A. You can get there if you know the opening balance, yes. Then the transaction information will help you get to a closing balance.  Q. Okay. And in fact, isn't it true maybe you don't know this, I don't know, but from your dealings with accountants, isn't it true that one of the things that auditors do is	2 3 4 02:26:43 5 6 7 8 9 02:26:57 10 11 12 13 14 02:27:09 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q. And in your analysis, did you also consider the preceding paragraph, where the author of this draft and by the way, this was a draft document, wasn't it?</li> <li>A. I believe so.</li> <li>Q was noting the cost of doing a full reconciliation of accounts?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. In fact and you've talked about the paragraph 19 exercise a little bit, right?</li> <li>A. I did.</li> <li>Q. And you know that was an extremely expensive process.</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. To select an account and reconcile every single transaction in it, right?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Isn't that the context of the statement here, that it wasn't a focus on the error rate caused by accounts, sampling,</li> </ul>
02:23:30 5 6 6 7 8 9 02:23:53 10 11 12 13 14 02:24:10 15 16 17 18	your third bullet point is also incorrect here, right?  A. No, but that's only one piece of it. It's also what we've talked about, there not being an ability to talk about the account balance.  Q. Now, the fourth bullet point, and you started talking about this just a couple of answers ago, about the notion of sampling transactions instead of sampling account balances. Let me ask if, from a basic point of view, as a financial person, you understand of course that an account balance is the result of the transactions, right? I mean, the sum of transactions going in, reductions for transactions going out, right?  A. You can get there if you know the opening balance, yes. Then the transaction information will help you get to a closing balance.  Q. Okay. And in fact, isn't it true maybe you don't know this, I don't know, but from your dealings with accountants, isn't it true that one of the things that auditors do is assess is look at transactions to come to a conclusion about	2 3 4 02:26:43 5 6 7 8 9 02:26:57 10 11 12 13 14 02:27:09 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Q. And in your analysis, did you also consider the preceding paragraph, where the author of this draft and by the way, this was a draft document, wasn't it?</li> <li>A. I believe so.</li> <li>Q was noting the cost of doing a full reconciliation of accounts?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. In fact and you've talked about the paragraph 19 exercise a little bit, right?</li> <li>A. I did.</li> <li>Q. And you know that was an extremely expensive process.</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. To select an account and reconcile every single transaction in it, right?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Isn't that the context of the statement here, that it wasn't a focus on the error rate caused by accounts, sampling, it was the cost of doing account reconciliations, 100 percent</li> </ul>
02:23:30 5 66 77 88 99 02:23:53 10 11 12 13 14 02:24:10 15 16 17 18 19 02:24:27 20	your third bullet point is also incorrect here, right?  A. No, but that's only one piece of it. It's also what we've talked about, there not being an ability to talk about the account balance.  Q. Now, the fourth bullet point, and you started talking about this just a couple of answers ago, about the notion of sampling transactions instead of sampling account balances. Let me ask if, from a basic point of view, as a financial person, you understand of course that an account balance is the result of the transactions, right? I mean, the sum of transactions going in, reductions for transactions going out, right?  A. You can get there if you know the opening balance, yes. Then the transaction information will help you get to a closing balance.  Q. Okay. And in fact, isn't it true maybe you don't know this, I don't know, but from your dealings with accountants, isn't it true that one of the things that auditors do is assess is look at transactions to come to a conclusion about how reliable the business systems are that are used to generate	2 3 4 02:26:43 5 6 7 8 9 02:26:57 10 11 12 13 14 02:27:09 15 16 17 18 19 02:27:26 20	<ul> <li>Q. And in your analysis, did you also consider the preceding paragraph, where the author of this draft and by the way, this was a draft document, wasn't it?</li> <li>A. I believe so.</li> <li>Q was noting the cost of doing a full reconciliation of accounts?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. In fact and you've talked about the paragraph 19 exercise a little bit, right?</li> <li>A. I did.</li> <li>Q. And you know that was an extremely expensive process.</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. To select an account and reconcile every single transaction in it, right?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Isn't that the context of the statement here, that it wasn't a focus on the error rate caused by accounts, sampling, it was the cost of doing account reconciliations, 100 percent verification?</li> </ul>
02:23:30 5 66 77 8 9 02:23:53 10 11 12 13 14 02:24:10 15 16 17 18 19 02:24:27 20 21	your third bullet point is also incorrect here, right?  A. No, but that's only one piece of it. It's also what we've talked about, there not being an ability to talk about the account balance.  Q. Now, the fourth bullet point, and you started talking about this just a couple of answers ago, about the notion of sampling transactions instead of sampling account balances. Let me ask if, from a basic point of view, as a financial person, you understand of course that an account balance is the result of the transactions, right? I mean, the sum of transactions going in, reductions for transactions going out, right?  A. You can get there if you know the opening balance, yes. Then the transaction information will help you get to a closing balance.  Q. Okay. And in fact, isn't it true maybe you don't know this, I don't know, but from your dealings with accountants, isn't it true that one of the things that auditors do is assess is look at transactions to come to a conclusion about how reliable the business systems are that are used to generate reports such as account statements?	2 3 4 02:26:43 5 6 7 8 9 02:26:57 10 11 12 13 14 02:27:09 15 16 17 18 19 02:27:26 20 21	<ul> <li>Q. And in your analysis, did you also consider the preceding paragraph, where the author of this draft and by the way, this was a draft document, wasn't it?</li> <li>A. I believe so.</li> <li>Q was noting the cost of doing a full reconciliation of accounts?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. In fact and you've talked about the paragraph 19 exercise a little bit, right?</li> <li>A. I did.</li> <li>Q. And you know that was an extremely expensive process.</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. To select an account and reconcile every single transaction in it, right?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Isn't that the context of the statement here, that it wasn't a focus on the error rate caused by accounts, sampling, it was the cost of doing account reconciliations, 100 percent verification?</li> <li>A. You're talking about two different concepts. You're</li> </ul>
02:23:30 5 6 7 8 9 02:23:53 10 11 12 13 14 02:24:10 15 16 17 18 19 02:24:27 20 21 22	your third bullet point is also incorrect here, right?  A. No, but that's only one piece of it. It's also what we've talked about, there not being an ability to talk about the account balance.  Q. Now, the fourth bullet point, and you started talking about this just a couple of answers ago, about the notion of sampling transactions instead of sampling account balances. Let me ask if, from a basic point of view, as a financial person, you understand of course that an account balance is the result of the transactions, right? I mean, the sum of transactions going in, reductions for transactions going out, right?  A. You can get there if you know the opening balance, yes. Then the transaction information will help you get to a closing balance.  Q. Okay. And in fact, isn't it true maybe you don't know this, I don't know, but from your dealings with accountants, isn't it true that one of the things that auditors do is assess is look at transactions to come to a conclusion about how reliable the business systems are that are used to generate reports such as account statements?  A. Well, certainly when you're looking to assess the integrity	2 3 4 02:26:43 5 6 7 8 9 02:26:57 10 11 12 13 14 02:27:09 15 16 17 18 19 02:27:26 20 21 22	<ul> <li>Q. And in your analysis, did you also consider the preceding paragraph, where the author of this draft and by the way, this was a draft document, wasn't it?</li> <li>A. I believe so.</li> <li>Q was noting the cost of doing a full reconciliation of accounts?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. In fact and you've talked about the paragraph 19 exercise a little bit, right?</li> <li>A. I did.</li> <li>Q. And you know that was an extremely expensive process.</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. To select an account and reconcile every single transaction in it, right?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Isn't that the context of the statement here, that it wasn't a focus on the error rate caused by accounts, sampling, it was the cost of doing account reconciliations, 100 percent verification?</li> <li>A. You're talking about two different concepts. You're talking about a hundred percent reconciliation on all accounts,</li> </ul>
02:23:30 5 66 77 8 9 02:23:53 10 11 12 13 14 02:24:10 15 16 17 18 19 02:24:27 20 21 22 23	your third bullet point is also incorrect here, right?  A. No, but that's only one piece of it. It's also what we've talked about, there not being an ability to talk about the account balance.  Q. Now, the fourth bullet point, and you started talking about this just a couple of answers ago, about the notion of sampling transactions instead of sampling account balances. Let me ask if, from a basic point of view, as a financial person, you understand of course that an account balance is the result of the transactions, right? I mean, the sum of transactions going in, reductions for transactions going out, right?  A. You can get there if you know the opening balance, yes. Then the transaction information will help you get to a closing balance.  Q. Okay. And in fact, isn't it true maybe you don't know this, I don't know, but from your dealings with accountants, isn't it true that one of the things that auditors do is assess is look at transactions to come to a conclusion about how reliable the business systems are that are used to generate reports such as account statements?  A. Well, certainly when you're looking to assess the integrity of a system, one of the tools that you can use is to measure	2 3 4 02:26:43 5 6 7 8 9 02:26:57 10 11 12 13 14 02:27:09 15 16 17 18 19 02:27:26 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. And in your analysis, did you also consider the preceding paragraph, where the author of this draft and by the way, this was a draft document, wasn't it?</li> <li>A. I believe so.</li> <li>Q was noting the cost of doing a full reconciliation of accounts?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. In fact and you've talked about the paragraph 19 exercise a little bit, right?</li> <li>A. I did.</li> <li>Q. And you know that was an extremely expensive process.</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. To select an account and reconcile every single transaction in it, right?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Isn't that the context of the statement here, that it wasn't a focus on the error rate caused by accounts, sampling, it was the cost of doing account reconciliations, 100 percent verification?</li> <li>A. You're talking about two different concepts. You're talking about a hundred percent reconciliation on all accounts, versus you're talking about taking a sample of an account and do</li> </ul>
02:23:30 5 66 77 88 99 02:23:53 10 11 12 13 14 02:24:10 15 16 17 18 19 02:24:27 20 21 22 23 24	your third bullet point is also incorrect here, right?  A. No, but that's only one piece of it. It's also what we've talked about, there not being an ability to talk about the account balance.  Q. Now, the fourth bullet point, and you started talking about this just a couple of answers ago, about the notion of sampling transactions instead of sampling account balances. Let me ask if, from a basic point of view, as a financial person, you understand of course that an account balance is the result of the transactions, right? I mean, the sum of transactions going in, reductions for transactions going out, right?  A. You can get there if you know the opening balance, yes. Then the transaction information will help you get to a closing balance.  Q. Okay. And in fact, isn't it true maybe you don't know this, I don't know, but from your dealings with accountants, isn't it true that one of the things that auditors do is assess is look at transactions to come to a conclusion about how reliable the business systems are that are used to generate reports such as account statements?  A. Well, certainly when you're looking to assess the integrity of a system, one of the tools that you can use is to measure transactions. That's certainly one tool.	2 3 4 02:26:43 5 6 7 8 9 02:26:57 10 11 12 13 14 02:27:09 15 16 17 18 19 02:27:26 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Q. And in your analysis, did you also consider the preceding paragraph, where the author of this draft and by the way, this was a draft document, wasn't it?</li> <li>A. I believe so.</li> <li>Q was noting the cost of doing a full reconciliation of accounts?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. In fact and you've talked about the paragraph 19 exercise a little bit, right?</li> <li>A. I did.</li> <li>Q. And you know that was an extremely expensive process.</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. To select an account and reconcile every single transaction in it, right?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Isn't that the context of the statement here, that it wasn't a focus on the error rate caused by accounts, sampling, it was the cost of doing account reconciliations, 100 percent verification?</li> <li>A. You're talking about two different concepts. You're talking about a hundred percent reconciliation on all accounts, versus you're talking about taking a sample of an account and do an analysis of every transaction in that account. The result</li> </ul>
02:23:30 5 66 77 88 9 02:23:53 10 11 12 13 14 02:24:10 15 16 17 18 19 02:24:27 20 21 22 23 24	your third bullet point is also incorrect here, right?  A. No, but that's only one piece of it. It's also what we've talked about, there not being an ability to talk about the account balance.  Q. Now, the fourth bullet point, and you started talking about this just a couple of answers ago, about the notion of sampling transactions instead of sampling account balances. Let me ask if, from a basic point of view, as a financial person, you understand of course that an account balance is the result of the transactions, right? I mean, the sum of transactions going in, reductions for transactions going out, right?  A. You can get there if you know the opening balance, yes. Then the transaction information will help you get to a closing balance.  Q. Okay. And in fact, isn't it true maybe you don't know this, I don't know, but from your dealings with accountants, isn't it true that one of the things that auditors do is assess is look at transactions to come to a conclusion about how reliable the business systems are that are used to generate reports such as account statements?  A. Well, certainly when you're looking to assess the integrity of a system, one of the tools that you can use is to measure transactions. That's certainly one tool.  Q. Okay. And if, for example, somebody's account opens as a	2 3 4 02:26:43 5 6 7 8 9 02:26:57 10 11 12 13 14 02:27:09 15 16 17 18 19 02:27:26 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Q. And in your analysis, did you also consider the preceding paragraph, where the author of this draft and by the way, this was a draft document, wasn't it?</li> <li>A. I believe so.</li> <li>Q was noting the cost of doing a full reconciliation of accounts?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. In fact and you've talked about the paragraph 19 exercise a little bit, right?</li> <li>A. I did.</li> <li>Q. And you know that was an extremely expensive process.</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. To select an account and reconcile every single transaction in it, right?</li> <li>A. Correct.</li> <li>Q. Isn't that the context of the statement here, that it wasn't a focus on the error rate caused by accounts, sampling, it was the cost of doing account reconciliations, 100 percent verification?</li> <li>A. You're talking about two different concepts. You're talking about a hundred percent reconciliation on all accounts, versus you're talking about taking a sample of an account and do an analysis of every transaction in that account. The result that if because sampling transactions, even with a very low</li> </ul>

i	1500		1502
1	error rate, will result in a relatively high error rate, as far	1	they're employing attribute sampling in this, right?
2	as an assurance standpoint on account balances, I think that is	2	A. I've only criticized to the extent that it won't accomplish
3	portrayed here accurately, and as a separate issue from the	3	the end objective. What I'm opining here is you need get to the
4	overall cost.	4	dollar difference on the account balance. Not an attribute,
02:28:02 5	It's just another weakness they've issued, is if we do this	02:30:34 <b>5</b>	yes/no, is the account balance correct? What is the dollar
6	transaction-by-transaction sampling, everybody needs to be on	6	difference on the account balance. If I were an individual
7	notice that we could only be able to say very limited things, or	7	account holder, that's what I would want to know, is my balance
8	I guess as it turns out nothing, about account balances.	8	right or not.
9	THE COURT: Mr. Warshawsky, you yourself are the one	9	Q. So you'd advocate using a variable analysis, right?
02:28:18 10	who has interposed a number of "speaks for itself" objections.	02:30:45 10	A. I certainly think you could do both attribute and variable,
11	You also want to downplay this exhibit as only a draft. Why do	11	but in the end, as an account holder, I'm not really going to
12	you need to quarrel with this witness about his interpretation	12	appreciate it much if you just tell me your account balance is
13	of somebody else's document that's only a draft and it speaks	13	wrong. I would like to know by how much.
14	for itself?	14	Q. That's accomplished through a variable analysis, right?
02:28:37 15	MR. WARSHAWSKY: Your Honor, I won't first of all,	02:31:00 15	A. It could in part. It could be accomplished by an attribute
16	I'm going to try not to quarrel with Mr. Duncan. Mr. Duncan has	16	analysis first and then a follow-up with a variable sample.
17	focused on one specific statement in there and attributed a	17	Q. Okay. Let's go back to your expert report. Again the
18	motive to the Interior Department based on his reading of that	18	executive summary, page 5. Specifically, you criticized in
19	sentence, and I think it's simply important for the Court to	19	the what we have on the screen here now, it looks like it's
02:28:55 <b>20</b>	appreciate the full the context of that statement.	02:31:25 <b>20</b>	the fourth bullet point, but this is actually the fifth on the
21	MR. GINGOLD: Objection, Your Honor. He did not	21	page, the one about the statistical sampling plan I'm sorry,
22	attribute a motive to	22	the statistical sampling design employed attribute sampling.
23	THE COURT: I didn't hear him attribute motive either,	23	A. Correct.
24	but go ahead, Mr. Warshawsky.	24	Q. In fact, having looked at things such as the September 30,
02:29:08 25	MR. WARSHAWSKY: Well, Your Honor, it actually was in	02:31:41 <b>25</b>	2005, NORC report that we've gone through just a few moments
	Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR		Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
	Official Court Reporter		Official Court Reporter
	1501		1503
1	his report, and I think he has but we can move on.	1	ago, isn't it true that Interior utilized both attribute and
2	MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, you instructed us to deal	2	variable sampling in this?
3	with opinions as stated in this court. I object on any further	3	A. I didn't have the advantage of having Dr. Hinkins' opinions
4	discussion	4	before I drafted this report, but it's clear that they are
02:29:22 <b>5</b>	THE COURT: It's gone over my head, counsel. Both of	02:31:58 <b>5</b>	taking this the next step, which was hypothesized back in '03
6	you. Proceed, Mr. Warshawsky.	6	that that might happen but not articulated how. It is now clear
7			that that hight happen but not articulated now. It is now clear
	MR. WARSHAWSKY: Okay.	7	that they are taking that next step of looking at the variable
8	MR. WARSHAWSKY: Okay. BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:	7 8	
8	·		that they are taking that next step of looking at the variable
	BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:		that they are taking that next step of looking at the variable portion as well.
9	BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:  Q. The one thing I did want to ask you is the sentence that	8 9	that they are taking that next step of looking at the variable portion as well.  Q. Okay. So that's been clarified to you.
9 02:29:35 <b>10</b>	BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:  Q. The one thing I did want to ask you is the sentence that follows what you referred to in your testimony, where the author	8 9 02:32:13 <b>10</b>	that they are taking that next step of looking at the variable portion as well.  Q. Okay. So that's been clarified to you.  A. Yes.
9 02:29:35 10 11	BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:  Q. The one thing I did want to ask you is the sentence that follows what you referred to in your testimony, where the author of this document wrote, "Clearly the numbers that should be	8 9 02:32:13 10 11	that they are taking that next step of looking at the variable portion as well.  Q. Okay. So that's been clarified to you.  A. Yes.  Q. Okay. Next bullet point you talked about, and you did
9 02:29:35 10 11 12	BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:  Q. The one thing I did want to ask you is the sentence that follows what you referred to in your testimony, where the author of this document wrote, "Clearly the numbers that should be estimated is the amount of the dollars in error, not the	8 9 02:32:13 10 11 12	that they are taking that next step of looking at the variable portion as well.  Q. Okay. So that's been clarified to you.  A. Yes.  Q. Okay. Next bullet point you talked about, and you did spend a lot of time talking about this in your direct. I want
9 02:29:35 10 11 12 13	BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:  Q. The one thing I did want to ask you is the sentence that follows what you referred to in your testimony, where the author of this document wrote, "Clearly the numbers that should be estimated is the amount of the dollars in error, not the percentage of accounts with at least one error." Did you	8 9 02:32:13 10 11 12 13	that they are taking that next step of looking at the variable portion as well.  Q. Okay. So that's been clarified to you.  A. Yes.  Q. Okay. Next bullet point you talked about, and you did spend a lot of time talking about this in your direct. I want to spend a few moments at least talking about it as well. The
9 02:29:35 10 11 12 13 14 02:29:49 15 16	BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:  Q. The one thing I did want to ask you is the sentence that follows what you referred to in your testimony, where the author of this document wrote, "Clearly the numbers that should be estimated is the amount of the dollars in error, not the percentage of accounts with at least one error." Did you consider that one as well in your analysis?	8 9 02:32:13 10 11 12 13 14	that they are taking that next step of looking at the variable portion as well.  Q. Okay. So that's been clarified to you.  A. Yes.  Q. Okay. Next bullet point you talked about, and you did spend a lot of time talking about this in your direct. I want to spend a few moments at least talking about it as well. The definition of a deviation or an error. And for that, let's go
9 02:29:35 10 11 12 13 14 02:29:49 15 16 17	BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:  Q. The one thing I did want to ask you is the sentence that follows what you referred to in your testimony, where the author of this document wrote, "Clearly the numbers that should be estimated is the amount of the dollars in error, not the percentage of accounts with at least one error." Did you consider that one as well in your analysis?  A. I did. That goes to the notion that what they're trying to	8 9 02:32:13 10 11 12 13 14 02:32:29 15 16 17	that they are taking that next step of looking at the variable portion as well.  Q. Okay. So that's been clarified to you.  A. Yes.  Q. Okay. Next bullet point you talked about, and you did spend a lot of time talking about this in your direct. I want to spend a few moments at least talking about it as well. The definition of a deviation or an error. And for that, let's go to page 24 of your report, please. Actually, why don't we move
9 02:29:35 10 11 12 13 14 02:29:49 15 16 17 18	BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:  Q. The one thing I did want to ask you is the sentence that follows what you referred to in your testimony, where the author of this document wrote, "Clearly the numbers that should be estimated is the amount of the dollars in error, not the percentage of accounts with at least one error." Did you consider that one as well in your analysis?  A. I did. That goes to the notion that what they're trying to estimate is whether or not the transactions were correct,	8 9 02:32:13 10 11 12 13 14 02:32:29 15 16	that they are taking that next step of looking at the variable portion as well.  Q. Okay. So that's been clarified to you.  A. Yes.  Q. Okay. Next bullet point you talked about, and you did spend a lot of time talking about this in your direct. I want to spend a few moments at least talking about it as well. The definition of a deviation or an error. And for that, let's go to page 24 of your report, please. Actually, why don't we move ahead to page 27. And up at the top, you see up here let's
9 02:29:35 10 11 12 13 14 02:29:49 15 16 17	BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:  Q. The one thing I did want to ask you is the sentence that follows what you referred to in your testimony, where the author of this document wrote, "Clearly the numbers that should be estimated is the amount of the dollars in error, not the percentage of accounts with at least one error." Did you consider that one as well in your analysis?  A. I did. That goes to the notion that what they're trying to estimate is whether or not the transactions were correct, whether or not the account histories as they were recorded, were	8 9 02:32:13 10 11 12 13 14 02:32:29 15 16 17	that they are taking that next step of looking at the variable portion as well.  Q. Okay. So that's been clarified to you.  A. Yes.  Q. Okay. Next bullet point you talked about, and you did spend a lot of time talking about this in your direct. I want to spend a few moments at least talking about it as well. The definition of a deviation or an error. And for that, let's go to page 24 of your report, please. Actually, why don't we move ahead to page 27. And up at the top, you see up here let's blow that up, please.
9 02:29:35 10 11 12 13 14 02:29:49 15 16 17 18	BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:  Q. The one thing I did want to ask you is the sentence that follows what you referred to in your testimony, where the author of this document wrote, "Clearly the numbers that should be estimated is the amount of the dollars in error, not the percentage of accounts with at least one error." Did you consider that one as well in your analysis?  A. I did. That goes to the notion that what they're trying to estimate is whether or not the transactions were correct, whether or not the account histories as they were recorded, were those correct. But it ignores the notion that, what my	8 9 02:32:13 10 11 12 13 14 02:32:29 15 16 17 18	that they are taking that next step of looking at the variable portion as well.  Q. Okay. So that's been clarified to you.  A. Yes.  Q. Okay. Next bullet point you talked about, and you did spend a lot of time talking about this in your direct. I want to spend a few moments at least talking about it as well. The definition of a deviation or an error. And for that, let's go to page 24 of your report, please. Actually, why don't we move ahead to page 27. And up at the top, you see up here let's blow that up, please.  You went through on pages 27, 28 of your report your
9 02:29:35 10 11 12 13 14 02:29:49 15 16 17 18 19 02:30:06 20 21	BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:  Q. The one thing I did want to ask you is the sentence that follows what you referred to in your testimony, where the author of this document wrote, "Clearly the numbers that should be estimated is the amount of the dollars in error, not the percentage of accounts with at least one error." Did you consider that one as well in your analysis?  A. I did. That goes to the notion that what they're trying to estimate is whether or not the transactions were correct, whether or not the account histories as they were recorded, were those correct. But it ignores the notion that, what my understanding of what the Court has ordered, is the account	8 9 02:32:13 10 11 12 13 14 02:32:29 15 16 17 18 19	that they are taking that next step of looking at the variable portion as well.  Q. Okay. So that's been clarified to you.  A. Yes.  Q. Okay. Next bullet point you talked about, and you did spend a lot of time talking about this in your direct. I want to spend a few moments at least talking about it as well. The definition of a deviation or an error. And for that, let's go to page 24 of your report, please. Actually, why don't we move ahead to page 27. And up at the top, you see up here let's blow that up, please.  You went through on pages 27, 28 of your report your analysis of the various types of transactions which you
9 02:29:35 10 11 12 13 14 02:29:49 15 16 17 18 19 02:30:06 20 21 22	BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:  Q. The one thing I did want to ask you is the sentence that follows what you referred to in your testimony, where the author of this document wrote, "Clearly the numbers that should be estimated is the amount of the dollars in error, not the percentage of accounts with at least one error." Did you consider that one as well in your analysis?  A. I did. That goes to the notion that what they're trying to estimate is whether or not the transactions were correct, whether or not the account histories as they were recorded, were those correct. But it ignores the notion that, what my understanding of what the Court has ordered, is the account balances are required as part of that.	8 9 02:32:13 10 11 12 13 14 02:32:29 15 16 17 18 19 02:33:24 20	that they are taking that next step of looking at the variable portion as well.  Q. Okay. So that's been clarified to you.  A. Yes.  Q. Okay. Next bullet point you talked about, and you did spend a lot of time talking about this in your direct. I want to spend a few moments at least talking about it as well. The definition of a deviation or an error. And for that, let's go to page 24 of your report, please. Actually, why don't we move ahead to page 27. And up at the top, you see up here let's blow that up, please.  You went through on pages 27, 28 of your report your analysis of the various types of transactions which you concluded would not be considered errors; is that correct?
9 02:29:35 10 11 12 13 14 02:29:49 15 16 17 18 19 02:30:06 20 21	BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:  Q. The one thing I did want to ask you is the sentence that follows what you referred to in your testimony, where the author of this document wrote, "Clearly the numbers that should be estimated is the amount of the dollars in error, not the percentage of accounts with at least one error." Did you consider that one as well in your analysis?  A. I did. That goes to the notion that what they're trying to estimate is whether or not the transactions were correct, whether or not the account histories as they were recorded, were those correct. But it ignores the notion that, what my understanding of what the Court has ordered, is the account balances are required as part of that.  Q. If you simply look at the number of accounts that are in	8 9 02:32:13 10 11 12 13 14 02:32:29 15 16 17 18 19 02:33:24 20 21	that they are taking that next step of looking at the variable portion as well.  Q. Okay. So that's been clarified to you.  A. Yes.  Q. Okay. Next bullet point you talked about, and you did spend a lot of time talking about this in your direct. I want to spend a few moments at least talking about it as well. The definition of a deviation or an error. And for that, let's go to page 24 of your report, please. Actually, why don't we move ahead to page 27. And up at the top, you see up here let's blow that up, please.  You went through on pages 27, 28 of your report your analysis of the various types of transactions which you concluded would not be considered errors; is that correct?  A. Correct. Based on my read of the administrative record.
9 02:29:35 10 11 12 13 14 02:29:49 15 16 17 18 19 02:30:06 20 21 22 23 24	BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:  Q. The one thing I did want to ask you is the sentence that follows what you referred to in your testimony, where the author of this document wrote, "Clearly the numbers that should be estimated is the amount of the dollars in error, not the percentage of accounts with at least one error." Did you consider that one as well in your analysis?  A. I did. That goes to the notion that what they're trying to estimate is whether or not the transactions were correct, whether or not the account histories as they were recorded, were those correct. But it ignores the notion that, what my understanding of what the Court has ordered, is the account balances are required as part of that.  Q. If you simply look at the number of accounts that are in error, or look at an account error rate, isn't that essentially	8 9 02:32:13 10 11 12 13 14 02:32:29 15 16 17 18 19 02:33:24 20 21 22 23 24	that they are taking that next step of looking at the variable portion as well.  Q. Okay. So that's been clarified to you.  A. Yes.  Q. Okay. Next bullet point you talked about, and you did spend a lot of time talking about this in your direct. I want to spend a few moments at least talking about it as well. The definition of a deviation or an error. And for that, let's go to page 24 of your report, please. Actually, why don't we move ahead to page 27. And up at the top, you see up here let's blow that up, please.  You went through on pages 27, 28 of your report your analysis of the various types of transactions which you concluded would not be considered errors; is that correct?  A. Correct. Based on my read of the administrative record.  Q. Well, now specifically your report seems to be citing the
9 02:29:35 10 11 12 13 14 02:29:49 15 16 17 18 19 02:30:06 20 21 22 23	BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:  Q. The one thing I did want to ask you is the sentence that follows what you referred to in your testimony, where the author of this document wrote, "Clearly the numbers that should be estimated is the amount of the dollars in error, not the percentage of accounts with at least one error." Did you consider that one as well in your analysis?  A. I did. That goes to the notion that what they're trying to estimate is whether or not the transactions were correct, whether or not the account histories as they were recorded, were those correct. But it ignores the notion that, what my understanding of what the Court has ordered, is the account balances are required as part of that.  Q. If you simply look at the number of accounts that are in error, or look at an account error rate, isn't that essentially an attribute analysis?	8 9 02:32:13 10 11 12 13 14 02:32:29 15 16 17 18 19 02:33:24 20 21 22 23	that they are taking that next step of looking at the variable portion as well.  Q. Okay. So that's been clarified to you.  A. Yes.  Q. Okay. Next bullet point you talked about, and you did spend a lot of time talking about this in your direct. I want to spend a few moments at least talking about it as well. The definition of a deviation or an error. And for that, let's go to page 24 of your report, please. Actually, why don't we move ahead to page 27. And up at the top, you see up here let's blow that up, please.  You went through on pages 27, 28 of your report your analysis of the various types of transactions which you concluded would not be considered errors; is that correct?  A. Correct. Based on my read of the administrative record.  Q. Well, now specifically your report seems to be citing the definition of difference in error and the definition of
9 02:29:35 10 11 12 13 14 02:29:49 15 16 17 18 19 02:30:06 20 21 22 23 24	BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:  Q. The one thing I did want to ask you is the sentence that follows what you referred to in your testimony, where the author of this document wrote, "Clearly the numbers that should be estimated is the amount of the dollars in error, not the percentage of accounts with at least one error." Did you consider that one as well in your analysis?  A. I did. That goes to the notion that what they're trying to estimate is whether or not the transactions were correct, whether or not the account histories as they were recorded, were those correct. But it ignores the notion that, what my understanding of what the Court has ordered, is the account balances are required as part of that.  Q. If you simply look at the number of accounts that are in error, or look at an account error rate, isn't that essentially an attribute analysis?  A. It is.	8 9 02:32:13 10 11 12 13 14 02:32:29 15 16 17 18 19 02:33:24 20 21 22 23 24	that they are taking that next step of looking at the variable portion as well.  Q. Okay. So that's been clarified to you.  A. Yes.  Q. Okay. Next bullet point you talked about, and you did spend a lot of time talking about this in your direct. I want to spend a few moments at least talking about it as well. The definition of a deviation or an error. And for that, let's go to page 24 of your report, please. Actually, why don't we move ahead to page 27. And up at the top, you see up here let's blow that up, please.  You went through on pages 27, 28 of your report your analysis of the various types of transactions which you concluded would not be considered errors; is that correct?  A. Correct. Based on my read of the administrative record.  Q. Well, now specifically your report seems to be citing the definition of difference in error and the definition of difference rate and error rate in the plan, and then you stated:
9 02:29:35 10 11 12 13 14 02:29:49 15 16 17 18 19 02:30:06 20 21 22 23 24	BY MR. WARSHAWSKY:  Q. The one thing I did want to ask you is the sentence that follows what you referred to in your testimony, where the author of this document wrote, "Clearly the numbers that should be estimated is the amount of the dollars in error, not the percentage of accounts with at least one error." Did you consider that one as well in your analysis?  A. I did. That goes to the notion that what they're trying to estimate is whether or not the transactions were correct, whether or not the account histories as they were recorded, were those correct. But it ignores the notion that, what my understanding of what the Court has ordered, is the account balances are required as part of that.  Q. If you simply look at the number of accounts that are in error, or look at an account error rate, isn't that essentially an attribute analysis?  A. It is.  Q. Okay. And you've criticized Interior because you believe  Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR  Official Court Reporter	8 9 02:32:13 10 11 12 13 14 02:32:29 15 16 17 18 19 02:33:24 20 21 22 23 24 02:33:44 25	that they are taking that next step of looking at the variable portion as well.  Q. Okay. So that's been clarified to you.  A. Yes.  Q. Okay. Next bullet point you talked about, and you did spend a lot of time talking about this in your direct. I want to spend a few moments at least talking about it as well. The definition of a deviation or an error. And for that, let's go to page 24 of your report, please. Actually, why don't we move ahead to page 27. And up at the top, you see up here let's blow that up, please.  You went through on pages 27, 28 of your report your analysis of the various types of transactions which you concluded would not be considered errors; is that correct?  A. Correct. Based on my read of the administrative record.  Q. Well, now specifically your report seems to be citing the definition of difference in error and the definition of difference rate and error rate in the plan, and then you stated:  "Transactions not considered to be deviations according to the Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR  Official Court Reporter

	1504		1506
1	plan definitions." So you really considered more than just the	1	proportion of it exactly is only largely consistent with
2	definitions in reaching these conclusions?	2	supporting documents.
3	A. You mean in reading the entire plan?	3	Q. Okay. So to understand your opinion we need to know what
4	<b>Q.</b> In reaching your conclusions below about transactions which	4	you mean by the word "largely"?
2:34:02 <b>5</b>	you said would not be considered deviations.	02:36:35 <b>5</b>	A. Well, yeah. It either is consistent or is not consistent.
6	A. Well, what I'm saying here is that according to the 2007	6	But the 2007 Plan, if it's largely consistent in other words,
7	Plan, according to my read of the plan, these notions would not	7	if there is, by recomputing it or by looking at third-party
8	be considered as deviations.	8	documents we're able to say it looks right, that's not
9	Q. Okay. So your analysis was more than just definitions,	9	considered a deviation.
:34:16 10	right?	02:36:52 10	Q. Is the word "largely," is that your word or does that
11	A. Correct.	11	appear in something like the accounting standards manual?
12	Q. Okay. You reviewed the accounting standards manual?	12	A. I don't recall reading that specifically in the ASM.
13	A. Yes.	13	Q. Okay. Next item you listed, a group of missing, erroneous
14	Q. Okay. Did you consider how the accounting standards manual	14	or omitted transactions. With respect to the first two bullet
34:27 15	described these types of errors in your analysis?	02:37:13 15	points, those that were never entered into the transaction
16	A. Generally, yes.	16	ledgers and those that were removed from the transaction
17	Q. Generally. I mean, you didn't think that that was the real	17	ledgers, wouldn't those types of transactions be addressed
18	authority to go to to determine whether or not an item would be	18	through this work that we've been talking about, the DCV,
19	considered an error?	19	land-to-dollars testing, posting work?
34:42 <b>20</b>	A. Well, it first of all varies by different types of	02:37:32 <b>20</b>	A. They could potentially be included in that universe.
21	transactions, it varies by different types of credits, debits,	21	Q. All right. Transactions that were intentionally altered,
22	whether or not they're oil and gas collections, whether or not	22	accidentally altered or erroneously entered. If that happened,
23	they're check disbursements. So what I tried to do was distill	23	wouldn't those types of transactions be inconsistent with
24	down the essence of this notion of what's considered a deviation	24	supporting documentation?
4:59 <b>25</b>	and what's not, and it interweaves both the notion of	02:37:55 <b>25</b>	A. Not necessarily. Again, I don't know what the alternative
94:59 <b>ZU</b>	Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR	02:37:55 20	Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
	Official Court Reporter		Official Court Reporter
	1505		1507
1	reconciliation activities, part of which are then included in	1	procedure that would be used to substantiate it, whether or no
2	the ASM manual, but also part of the extrapolation that's done	2	that would detect something that was intentionally altered or
3	by NORC, where for instance these de minimis rules are applied	3	not.
4	as to whether or not there's actually an error.	4	Q. What do you mean by an intentionally altered transaction?
5:14	The accounting would catch a lot of these. Like with the	02:38:07 <b>5</b>	A. Well, it could be something that was, as Ms. Redthunder w
6	one we looked at, the only one we've been able to look at, the	6	testifying to this morning, where a person was taking funds fro
7	Deloitte & Touche study showed us where it was off. They	7	a person that's disabled or otherwise that they're watching
8	captured that in the accounting. The de minimis rule was	8	over, if they're inside of the BIA, they could go back and make
9	applied later on in the extrapolation process.		
		9	a transfer and intentionally alter the documentation associated
35:31 10	• • •	02:38:27	•
	Q. Okay. You didn't talk about any of that in your report	02:38:27 10	with that transfer.
11	Q. Okay. You didn't talk about any of that in your report here, right?	02:38:27 10	with that transfer.  Q. But ultimately if the accountant selected that transaction
11 12	<ul><li>Q. Okay. You didn't talk about any of that in your report here, right?</li><li>A. That's correct. I testified to that content to the Judge.</li></ul>	02:38:27 <b>10</b> 11 12	<ul><li>with that transfer.</li><li>Q. But ultimately if the accountant selected that transaction and reviewed supporting documentation, wouldn't that reveal</li></ul>
11 12 13	<ul> <li>Q. Okay. You didn't talk about any of that in your report here, right?</li> <li>A. That's correct. I testified to that content to the Judge.</li> <li>Q. Well, let's see now. You say transactions not considered</li> </ul>	02:38:27 10 11 12 13	with that transfer.  Q. But ultimately if the accountant selected that transaction and reviewed supporting documentation, wouldn't that reveal whether that transaction had been altered?
11 12 13 14	<ul> <li>Q. Okay. You didn't talk about any of that in your report here, right?</li> <li>A. That's correct. I testified to that content to the Judge.</li> <li>Q. Well, let's see now. You say transactions not considered to be deviations, and the first item you said recorded</li> </ul>	02:38:27 10 11 12 13 14	with that transfer.  Q. But ultimately if the accountant selected that transaction and reviewed supporting documentation, wouldn't that reveal whether that transaction had been altered?  A. May or may not. It depends again in my experience in
11 12 13 14 15	<ul> <li>Q. Okay. You didn't talk about any of that in your report here, right?</li> <li>A. That's correct. I testified to that content to the Judge.</li> <li>Q. Well, let's see now. You say transactions not considered to be deviations, and the first item you said recorded transactions largely consistent with supporting documents that</li> </ul>	02:38:27 10 11 12 13 14 02:38:42 15	with that transfer.  Q. But ultimately if the accountant selected that transaction and reviewed supporting documentation, wouldn't that reveal whether that transaction had been altered?  A. May or may not. It depends again in my experience in dealing with trying to identify and detect fraud in
11 12 13 14 35:44 15 16	<ul> <li>Q. Okay. You didn't talk about any of that in your report here, right?</li> <li>A. That's correct. I testified to that content to the Judge.</li> <li>Q. Well, let's see now. You say transactions not considered to be deviations, and the first item you said recorded transactions largely consistent with supporting documents that are found. Are you telling Judge Robertson that a transaction</li> </ul>	02:38:27 10 11 12 13 14 02:38:42 15 16	with that transfer.  Q. But ultimately if the accountant selected that transaction and reviewed supporting documentation, wouldn't that reveal whether that transaction had been altered?  A. May or may not. It depends again in my experience in dealing with trying to identify and detect fraud in organizations, those are exactly the kind of transactions where
11 12 13 14 15 16 17	<ul> <li>Q. Okay. You didn't talk about any of that in your report here, right?</li> <li>A. That's correct. I testified to that content to the Judge.</li> <li>Q. Well, let's see now. You say transactions not considered to be deviations, and the first item you said recorded transactions largely consistent with supporting documents that are found. Are you telling Judge Robertson that a transaction that's supported by that's largely consistent with supporting</li> </ul>	02:38:27 10 11 12 13 14 02:38:42 15 16 17	with that transfer.  Q. But ultimately if the accountant selected that transaction and reviewed supporting documentation, wouldn't that reveal whether that transaction had been altered?  A. May or may not. It depends again in my experience in dealing with trying to identify and detect fraud in organizations, those are exactly the kind of transactions where you would anticipate that the supporting documentation would
11 12 13 14 35:44 15 16 17 18	<ul> <li>Q. Okay. You didn't talk about any of that in your report here, right?</li> <li>A. That's correct. I testified to that content to the Judge.</li> <li>Q. Well, let's see now. You say transactions not considered to be deviations, and the first item you said recorded transactions largely consistent with supporting documents that are found. Are you telling Judge Robertson that a transaction that's supported by that's largely consistent with supporting documentations, that should be considered a deviation?</li> </ul>	02:38:27 10 11 12 13 14 02:38:42 15 16 17 18	with that transfer.  Q. But ultimately if the accountant selected that transaction and reviewed supporting documentation, wouldn't that reveal whether that transaction had been altered?  A. May or may not. It depends again in my experience in dealing with trying to identify and detect fraud in organizations, those are exactly the kind of transactions where you would anticipate that the supporting documentation would both be altered, and so that it would support what had been
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Q. Okay. You didn't talk about any of that in your report here, right?</li> <li>A. That's correct. I testified to that content to the Judge.</li> <li>Q. Well, let's see now. You say transactions not considered to be deviations, and the first item you said recorded transactions largely consistent with supporting documents that are found. Are you telling Judge Robertson that a transaction that's supported by that's largely consistent with supporting documentations, that should be considered a deviation?</li> <li>A. Yeah. If it's inconsistent I mean there's this notion</li> </ul>	02:38:27 10 11 12 13 14 02:38:42 15 16 17 18	with that transfer.  Q. But ultimately if the accountant selected that transaction and reviewed supporting documentation, wouldn't that reveal whether that transaction had been altered?  A. May or may not. It depends again in my experience in dealing with trying to identify and detect fraud in organizations, those are exactly the kind of transactions where you would anticipate that the supporting documentation would both be altered, and so that it would support what had been done. Those are exactly the ones that are high risk.
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	<ul> <li>Q. Okay. You didn't talk about any of that in your report here, right?</li> <li>A. That's correct. I testified to that content to the Judge.</li> <li>Q. Well, let's see now. You say transactions not considered to be deviations, and the first item you said recorded transactions largely consistent with supporting documents that are found. Are you telling Judge Robertson that a transaction that's supported by that's largely consistent with supporting documentations, that should be considered a deviation?</li> <li>A. Yeah. If it's inconsistent I mean there's this notion of, under accounting code 1, there's this notion of it could be</li> </ul>	02:38:27 10 11 12 13 14 02:38:42 15 16 17 18 19 02:38:56 20	with that transfer.  Q. But ultimately if the accountant selected that transaction and reviewed supporting documentation, wouldn't that reveal whether that transaction had been altered?  A. May or may not. It depends again in my experience in dealing with trying to identify and detect fraud in organizations, those are exactly the kind of transactions where you would anticipate that the supporting documentation would both be altered, and so that it would support what had been done. Those are exactly the ones that are high risk.  Q. Okay. Cases of fraud are pretty unusual, though, aren't
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 36:01 20 21	<ul> <li>Q. Okay. You didn't talk about any of that in your report here, right?</li> <li>A. That's correct. I testified to that content to the Judge.</li> <li>Q. Well, let's see now. You say transactions not considered to be deviations, and the first item you said recorded transactions largely consistent with supporting documents that are found. Are you telling Judge Robertson that a transaction that's supported by that's largely consistent with supporting documentations, that should be considered a deviation?</li> <li>A. Yeah. If it's inconsistent I mean there's this notion of, under accounting code 1, there's this notion of it could be directly supported by a document, but it could also just be kind</li> </ul>	02:38:27 10 11 12 13 14 02:38:42 15 16 17 18 19 02:38:56 20 21	with that transfer.  Q. But ultimately if the accountant selected that transaction and reviewed supporting documentation, wouldn't that reveal whether that transaction had been altered?  A. May or may not. It depends again in my experience in dealing with trying to identify and detect fraud in organizations, those are exactly the kind of transactions where you would anticipate that the supporting documentation would both be altered, and so that it would support what had been done. Those are exactly the ones that are high risk.  Q. Okay. Cases of fraud are pretty unusual, though, aren't they?
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 96:01 20 21	<ul> <li>Q. Okay. You didn't talk about any of that in your report here, right?</li> <li>A. That's correct. I testified to that content to the Judge.</li> <li>Q. Well, let's see now. You say transactions not considered to be deviations, and the first item you said recorded transactions largely consistent with supporting documents that are found. Are you telling Judge Robertson that a transaction that's supported by that's largely consistent with supporting documentations, that should be considered a deviation?</li> <li>A. Yeah. If it's inconsistent I mean there's this notion of, under accounting code 1, there's this notion of it could be directly supported by a document, but it could also just be kind of roughly consistent. And again, just for discussion purposes</li> </ul>	02:38:27 10 11 12 13 14 02:38:42 15 16 17 18 19 02:38:56 20 21 22	with that transfer.  Q. But ultimately if the accountant selected that transaction and reviewed supporting documentation, wouldn't that reveal whether that transaction had been altered?  A. May or may not. It depends again in my experience in dealing with trying to identify and detect fraud in organizations, those are exactly the kind of transactions where you would anticipate that the supporting documentation would both be altered, and so that it would support what had been done. Those are exactly the ones that are high risk.  Q. Okay. Cases of fraud are pretty unusual, though, aren't they?  A. Not in my experience.
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 36:01 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. Okay. You didn't talk about any of that in your report here, right?</li> <li>A. That's correct. I testified to that content to the Judge.</li> <li>Q. Well, let's see now. You say transactions not considered to be deviations, and the first item you said recorded transactions largely consistent with supporting documents that are found. Are you telling Judge Robertson that a transaction that's supported by that's largely consistent with supporting documentations, that should be considered a deviation?</li> <li>A. Yeah. If it's inconsistent I mean there's this notion of, under accounting code 1, there's this notion of it could be directly supported by a document, but it could also just be kind of roughly consistent. And again, just for discussion purposes here, if it's not exactly tied to a source document, I think</li> </ul>	02:38:27 10 11 12 13 14 02:38:42 15 16 17 18 19 02:38:56 20 21 22 23	with that transfer.  Q. But ultimately if the accountant selected that transaction and reviewed supporting documentation, wouldn't that reveal whether that transaction had been altered?  A. May or may not. It depends again in my experience in dealing with trying to identify and detect fraud in organizations, those are exactly the kind of transactions where you would anticipate that the supporting documentation would both be altered, and so that it would support what had been done. Those are exactly the ones that are high risk.  Q. Okay. Cases of fraud are pretty unusual, though, aren't they?  A. Not in my experience.  Q. Okay. Well, let me ask you about the last bullet point.
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 36:01 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Q. Okay. You didn't talk about any of that in your report here, right?</li> <li>A. That's correct. I testified to that content to the Judge.</li> <li>Q. Well, let's see now. You say transactions not considered to be deviations, and the first item you said recorded transactions largely consistent with supporting documents that are found. Are you telling Judge Robertson that a transaction that's supported by that's largely consistent with supporting documentations, that should be considered a deviation?</li> <li>A. Yeah. If it's inconsistent I mean there's this notion of, under accounting code 1, there's this notion of it could be directly supported by a document, but it could also just be kind of roughly consistent. And again, just for discussion purposes here, if it's not exactly tied to a source document, I think that's information, particularly as a statistician that's going</li> </ul>	02:38:27 10 11 12 13 14 02:38:42 15 16 17 18 19 02:38:56 20 21 22 23 24	with that transfer.  Q. But ultimately if the accountant selected that transaction and reviewed supporting documentation, wouldn't that reveal whether that transaction had been altered?  A. May or may not. It depends again in my experience in dealing with trying to identify and detect fraud in organizations, those are exactly the kind of transactions where you would anticipate that the supporting documentation would both be altered, and so that it would support what had been done. Those are exactly the ones that are high risk.  Q. Okay. Cases of fraud are pretty unusual, though, aren't they?  A. Not in my experience.  Q. Okay. Well, let me ask you about the last bullet point.  Transactions that never should have occurred. I'm sorry, I'm
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 36.01 20 21 22 23 24	<ul> <li>Q. Okay. You didn't talk about any of that in your report here, right?</li> <li>A. That's correct. I testified to that content to the Judge.</li> <li>Q. Well, let's see now. You say transactions not considered to be deviations, and the first item you said recorded transactions largely consistent with supporting documents that are found. Are you telling Judge Robertson that a transaction that's supported by that's largely consistent with supporting documentations, that should be considered a deviation?</li> <li>A. Yeah. If it's inconsistent I mean there's this notion of, under accounting code 1, there's this notion of it could be directly supported by a document, but it could also just be kind of roughly consistent. And again, just for discussion purposes here, if it's not exactly tied to a source document, I think that's information, particularly as a statistician that's going to try and extrapolate from it, I would need to understand what</li> </ul>	02:38:27 10 11 12 13 14 02:38:42 15 16 17 18 19 02:38:56 20 21 22 23	Q. But ultimately if the accountant selected that transaction and reviewed supporting documentation, wouldn't that reveal whether that transaction had been altered?  A. May or may not. It depends again in my experience in dealing with trying to identify and detect fraud in organizations, those are exactly the kind of transactions where you would anticipate that the supporting documentation would both be altered, and so that it would support what had been done. Those are exactly the ones that are high risk.  Q. Okay. Cases of fraud are pretty unusual, though, aren't they?  A. Not in my experience.  Q. Okay. Well, let me ask you about the last bullet point.  Transactions that never should have occurred. I'm sorry, I'm not sure what that means. What did you mean by that one?
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	<ul> <li>Q. Okay. You didn't talk about any of that in your report here, right?</li> <li>A. That's correct. I testified to that content to the Judge.</li> <li>Q. Well, let's see now. You say transactions not considered to be deviations, and the first item you said recorded transactions largely consistent with supporting documents that are found. Are you telling Judge Robertson that a transaction that's supported by that's largely consistent with supporting documentations, that should be considered a deviation?</li> <li>A. Yeah. If it's inconsistent I mean there's this notion of, under accounting code 1, there's this notion of it could be directly supported by a document, but it could also just be kind of roughly consistent. And again, just for discussion purposes here, if it's not exactly tied to a source document, I think that's information, particularly as a statistician that's going</li> </ul>	02:38:27 10 11 12 13 14 02:38:42 15 16 17 18 19 02:38:56 20 21 22 23 24	with that transfer.  Q. But ultimately if the accountant selected that transaction and reviewed supporting documentation, wouldn't that reveal whether that transaction had been altered?  A. May or may not. It depends again in my experience in dealing with trying to identify and detect fraud in organizations, those are exactly the kind of transactions where you would anticipate that the supporting documentation would both be altered, and so that it would support what had been done. Those are exactly the ones that are high risk.  Q. Okay. Cases of fraud are pretty unusual, though, aren't they?  A. Not in my experience.  Q. Okay. Well, let me ask you about the last bullet point.  Transactions that never should have occurred. I'm sorry, I'm

	1508		1510
1	A. Well, using an example that I used with Mr. Gingold this		You're talking about, to cut through it, in that instance
2	morning, if there was a collection that happened at Treasury,		you're really talking about issues like probate, direct pay, the
3	there was a million dollars that was collected, if those funds		inclusion of accounts as of 10/25/1994; is that right?
4	were posted over and it was a transaction, we should have never		4 A. Correct.
02:39:32 <b>5</b>	received any money or we should have received money but didn't	02:42:14	<b>Q.</b> And these are all legal issues, right?
6	get any, there could be a transaction that never should have	-	A. Correct. I'm just informing the Court as a matter of
7	occurred the way that it did, that's not going to be captured		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
8	here as a deviation.		and the program of the control of th
9	Q. But if you reviewed supporting documentation, you wouldn't		can't extrapolate beyond the electronic ledger era from which
02:39:48 10	be able to tell whether it was a transaction that should not	02:42:29	
11	have occurred?	1	•
12	A. First of all, you're assuming they are reviewing these	1:	
13	documents, and they're not. Under this example, they're not	1;	, , , J ,
14	going back over to Treasury to try and understand whether or not	14	
02:39:59 15	the allocation to the allottees occurred correctly. If you're	02:42:41	3 3 4 4 4
16	asking if they were doing that step, should they detect it?	102.42.41	
17	They probably would be able to detect something like that, which	1	•
18	is erroneous allocation.	18	
19	Q. Okay. Last item, you talked about recorded transactions	19	
02:40:15 20	where no supporting documentation could be found. Aren't those	02:43:03	
21	the unreconciled transactions that NORC treated as errors in	02:43:03 20	
22	their analysis?	2	3, , ,
23	A. No. There's lots of pieces of the reconciliation that	23	
24	don't have supporting documents. I mean, category 1, the top	24	
02:40:32 <b>25</b>	tier reconciled transaction, part of that have directly	02:43:54	, , , , , , , , , , ,
02:10:02	Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR	02:10:01	Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
	Official Court Reporter		Official Court Reporter
	•		•
	1509		1511
1	1509 supporting documents, but part of it does not. It's recomputed,		1511  Let me ask one last thing. You did talk about your
1 2	supporting documents, but part of it does not. It's recomputed,		Let me ask one last thing. You did talk about your
		:	Let me ask one last thing. You did talk about your
2	supporting documents, but part of it does not. It's recomputed, it's third-party documents. So then when you drop down to	;	Let me ask one last thing. You did talk about your criticism of the proposal to conduct a sample of the paper
3	supporting documents, but part of it does not. It's recomputed, it's third-party documents. So then when you drop down to category 2, you know it's not something that has a directly	;	Let me ask one last thing. You did talk about your  criticism of the proposal to conduct a sample of the paper  ledger era to determine whether the populations were essentially
2 3 4	supporting documents, but part of it does not. It's recomputed, it's third-party documents. So then when you drop down to category 2, you know it's not something that has a directly supporting document because it's already dropped all the way	02:44:08	Let me ask one last thing. You did talk about your criticism of the proposal to conduct a sample of the paper ledger era to determine whether the populations were essentially the same.
2 3 4 02:40:50 5	supporting documents, but part of it does not. It's recomputed, it's third-party documents. So then when you drop down to category 2, you know it's not something that has a directly supporting document because it's already dropped all the way down to category 2.	02:44:08	Let me ask one last thing. You did talk about your  criticism of the proposal to conduct a sample of the paper  ledger era to determine whether the populations were essentially  the same.  A. Correct.
2 3 4 02:40:50 5 6	supporting documents, but part of it does not. It's recomputed, it's third-party documents. So then when you drop down to category 2, you know it's not something that has a directly supporting document because it's already dropped all the way down to category 2.  So these are the kinds of things that you would anticipate,	02:44:08	Let me ask one last thing. You did talk about your  criticism of the proposal to conduct a sample of the paper  ledger era to determine whether the populations were essentially the same.  A. Correct.  Q. Okay. And you're familiar with the term initial hypothesis testing?
2 3 4 02:40:50 5 6 7	supporting documents, but part of it does not. It's recomputed, it's third-party documents. So then when you drop down to category 2, you know it's not something that has a directly supporting document because it's already dropped all the way down to category 2.  So these are the kinds of things that you would anticipate, given it's not required to have a directly supporting document	02:44:08	Let me ask one last thing. You did talk about your criticism of the proposal to conduct a sample of the paper ledger era to determine whether the populations were essentially the same. A. Correct. Q. Okay. And you're familiar with the term initial hypothesis testing? A. Yes.
2 3 4 02:40:50 5 6 7 8	supporting documents, but part of it does not. It's recomputed, it's third-party documents. So then when you drop down to category 2, you know it's not something that has a directly supporting document because it's already dropped all the way down to category 2.  So these are the kinds of things that you would anticipate, given it's not required to have a directly supporting document in order to do the reconciliation.	02:44:08	Let me ask one last thing. You did talk about your criticism of the proposal to conduct a sample of the paper ledger era to determine whether the populations were essentially the same. A. Correct. Q. Okay. And you're familiar with the term initial hypothesis testing? A. Yes. Q. And so you understand that that's simply a first step that
2 3 4 02:40:50 5 6 7 8 9	supporting documents, but part of it does not. It's recomputed, it's third-party documents. So then when you drop down to category 2, you know it's not something that has a directly supporting document because it's already dropped all the way down to category 2.  So these are the kinds of things that you would anticipate, given it's not required to have a directly supporting document in order to do the reconciliation.  Q. But you've already told us you don't know what's required	02:44:08	Let me ask one last thing. You did talk about your criticism of the proposal to conduct a sample of the paper ledger era to determine whether the populations were essentially the same. A. Correct. Q. Okay. And you're familiar with the term initial hypothesis testing? A. Yes. Q. And so you understand that that's simply a first step that Interior's proposing to do.
2 3 4 02:40:50 5 6 7 8 9 02:41:02 10 11	supporting documents, but part of it does not. It's recomputed, it's third-party documents. So then when you drop down to category 2, you know it's not something that has a directly supporting document because it's already dropped all the way down to category 2.  So these are the kinds of things that you would anticipate, given it's not required to have a directly supporting document in order to do the reconciliation.  Q. But you've already told us you don't know what's required for an item to be reconciled with category 2. Right?	02:44:08	Let me ask one last thing. You did talk about your criticism of the proposal to conduct a sample of the paper ledger era to determine whether the populations were essentially the same. A. Correct. Q. Okay. And you're familiar with the term initial hypothesis testing? A. Yes. Q. And so you understand that that's simply a first step that Interior's proposing to do. A. That's my understanding.
2 3 4 02:40:50 5 6 7 8 9 02:41:02 10 11	supporting documents, but part of it does not. It's recomputed, it's third-party documents. So then when you drop down to category 2, you know it's not something that has a directly supporting document because it's already dropped all the way down to category 2.  So these are the kinds of things that you would anticipate, given it's not required to have a directly supporting document in order to do the reconciliation.  Q. But you've already told us you don't know what's required for an item to be reconciled with category 2. Right?  A. That's exactly what I testified to, but I know what it's	02:44:08	Let me ask one last thing. You did talk about your criticism of the proposal to conduct a sample of the paper ledger era to determine whether the populations were essentially the same. A. Correct. Q. Okay. And you're familiar with the term initial hypothesis testing? A. Yes. Q. And so you understand that that's simply a first step that Interior's proposing to do. A. That's my understanding. Q. Based on your assumptions about the paper ledger era, it's
2 3 4 02:40:50 5 6 7 8 9 02:41:02 10 11 12 13 14	supporting documents, but part of it does not. It's recomputed, it's third-party documents. So then when you drop down to category 2, you know it's not something that has a directly supporting document because it's already dropped all the way down to category 2.  So these are the kinds of things that you would anticipate, given it's not required to have a directly supporting document in order to do the reconciliation.  Q. But you've already told us you don't know what's required for an item to be reconciled with category 2. Right?  A. That's exactly what I testified to, but I know what it's not, and it's not a directly supporting document or it would be	02:44:08	Let me ask one last thing. You did talk about your criticism of the proposal to conduct a sample of the paper ledger era to determine whether the populations were essentially the same. A. Correct. Q. Okay. And you're familiar with the term initial hypothesis testing? A. Yes. Q. And so you understand that that's simply a first step that Interior's proposing to do. A. That's my understanding. Q. Based on your assumptions about the paper ledger era, it's fair to say you expect that initial hypothesis test to be rejected?
2 3 4 02:40:50 5 6 7 8 9 02:41:02 10 11 12 13 14 02:41:16 15	supporting documents, but part of it does not. It's recomputed, it's third-party documents. So then when you drop down to category 2, you know it's not something that has a directly supporting document because it's already dropped all the way down to category 2.  So these are the kinds of things that you would anticipate, given it's not required to have a directly supporting document in order to do the reconciliation.  Q. But you've already told us you don't know what's required for an item to be reconciled with category 2. Right?  A. That's exactly what I testified to, but I know what it's not, and it's not a directly supporting document or it would be up in category 1.	02:44:08	Let me ask one last thing. You did talk about your criticism of the proposal to conduct a sample of the paper ledger era to determine whether the populations were essentially the same. A. Correct. Q. Okay. And you're familiar with the term initial hypothesis testing? A. Yes. Q. And so you understand that that's simply a first step that Interior's proposing to do. A. That's my understanding. Q. Based on your assumptions about the paper ledger era, it's fair to say you expect that initial hypothesis test to be rejected? A. Again, it goes back to the definition of the error. If
2 3 4 02:40:50 5 6 7 8 9 02:41:02 10 11 12 13 14 02:41:16 15 16	supporting documents, but part of it does not. It's recomputed, it's third-party documents. So then when you drop down to category 2, you know it's not something that has a directly supporting document because it's already dropped all the way down to category 2.  So these are the kinds of things that you would anticipate, given it's not required to have a directly supporting document in order to do the reconciliation.  Q. But you've already told us you don't know what's required for an item to be reconciled with category 2. Right?  A. That's exactly what I testified to, but I know what it's not, and it's not a directly supporting document or it would be up in category 1.  Q. Okay. So what you're referring to, you're not really	02:44:08	Let me ask one last thing. You did talk about your criticism of the proposal to conduct a sample of the paper ledger era to determine whether the populations were essentially the same.  A. Correct. Q. Okay. And you're familiar with the term initial hypothesis testing?  A. Yes. Q. And so you understand that that's simply a first step that Interior's proposing to do. A. That's my understanding. Q. Based on your assumptions about the paper ledger era, it's fair to say you expect that initial hypothesis test to be rejected? A. Again, it goes back to the definition of the error. If what you're looking for is an error and you're unlikely to find
2 3 4 02:40:50 5 6 7 8 9 02:41:02 10 11 12 13 14 02:41:16 15 16 17	supporting documents, but part of it does not. It's recomputed, it's third-party documents. So then when you drop down to category 2, you know it's not something that has a directly supporting document because it's already dropped all the way down to category 2.  So these are the kinds of things that you would anticipate, given it's not required to have a directly supporting document in order to do the reconciliation.  Q. But you've already told us you don't know what's required for an item to be reconciled with category 2. Right?  A. That's exactly what I testified to, but I know what it's not, and it's not a directly supporting document or it would be up in category 1.  Q. Okay. So what you're referring to, you're not really referring to no supporting documentation, you're talking about	02:44:08	Let me ask one last thing. You did talk about your criticism of the proposal to conduct a sample of the paper ledger era to determine whether the populations were essentially the same. A. Correct. Q. Okay. And you're familiar with the term initial hypothesis testing? A. Yes. Q. And so you understand that that's simply a first step that Interior's proposing to do. A. That's my understanding. Q. Based on your assumptions about the paper ledger era, it's fair to say you expect that initial hypothesis test to be rejected? A. Again, it goes back to the definition of the error. If what you're looking for is an error and you're unlikely to find it, not finding it in the paper ledger era, and that happens to
2 3 4 02:40:50 5 6 7 8 9 02:41:02 10 11 12 13 14 02:41:16 15 16 17 18	supporting documents, but part of it does not. It's recomputed, it's third-party documents. So then when you drop down to category 2, you know it's not something that has a directly supporting document because it's already dropped all the way down to category 2.  So these are the kinds of things that you would anticipate, given it's not required to have a directly supporting document in order to do the reconciliation.  Q. But you've already told us you don't know what's required for an item to be reconciled with category 2. Right?  A. That's exactly what I testified to, but I know what it's not, and it's not a directly supporting document or it would be up in category 1.  Q. Okay. So what you're referring to, you're not really referring to no supporting documentation, you're talking about transactions that don't have what you call directly supporting	02:44:08	Let me ask one last thing. You did talk about your criticism of the proposal to conduct a sample of the paper ledger era to determine whether the populations were essentially the same.  A. Correct. Q. Okay. And you're familiar with the term initial hypothesis testing? A. Yes. Q. And so you understand that that's simply a first step that Interior's proposing to do. A. That's my understanding. Q. Based on your assumptions about the paper ledger era, it's fair to say you expect that initial hypothesis test to be rejected? A. Again, it goes back to the definition of the error. If what you're looking for is an error and you're unlikely to find it, not finding it in the paper ledger era, I would anticipate
2 3 4 02:40:50 5 6 7 8 9 02:41:02 10 11 12 13 14 02:41:16 15 16 17 18 19	supporting documents, but part of it does not. It's recomputed, it's third-party documents. So then when you drop down to category 2, you know it's not something that has a directly supporting document because it's already dropped all the way down to category 2.  So these are the kinds of things that you would anticipate, given it's not required to have a directly supporting document in order to do the reconciliation.  Q. But you've already told us you don't know what's required for an item to be reconciled with category 2. Right?  A. That's exactly what I testified to, but I know what it's not, and it's not a directly supporting document or it would be up in category 1.  Q. Okay. So what you're referring to, you're not really referring to no supporting documentation, you're talking about transactions that don't have what you call directly supporting documentation; is that right?  A. Right. It's the notion of an alternative procedure. It's not a supporting document. It's an alternative procedure.	02:44:08	Let me ask one last thing. You did talk about your criticism of the proposal to conduct a sample of the paper ledger era to determine whether the populations were essentially the same.  A. Correct.  Q. Okay. And you're familiar with the term initial hypothesis testing?  A. Yes.  Q. And so you understand that that's simply a first step that Interior's proposing to do.  A. That's my understanding.  Q. Based on your assumptions about the paper ledger era, it's fair to say you expect that initial hypothesis test to be rejected?  A. Again, it goes back to the definition of the error. If what you're looking for is an error and you're unlikely to find it, not finding it in the paper ledger era, and that happens to be the same as the electronic ledger era, I would anticipate that if you define the error high enough, you won't see it in
2 3 4 02:40:50 5 6 7 8 9 02:41:02 10 11 12 13 14 02:41:16 15 16 17 18 19 02:41:29 20	supporting documents, but part of it does not. It's recomputed, it's third-party documents. So then when you drop down to category 2, you know it's not something that has a directly supporting document because it's already dropped all the way down to category 2.  So these are the kinds of things that you would anticipate, given it's not required to have a directly supporting document in order to do the reconciliation.  Q. But you've already told us you don't know what's required for an item to be reconciled with category 2. Right?  A. That's exactly what I testified to, but I know what it's not, and it's not a directly supporting document or it would be up in category 1.  Q. Okay. So what you're referring to, you're not really referring to no supporting documentation, you're talking about transactions that don't have what you call directly supporting documentation; is that right?  A. Right. It's the notion of an alternative procedure. It's not a supporting document. It's an alternative procedure.  Q. Okay. Let's go back to page 5 of your report, please.	02:44:08	Let me ask one last thing. You did talk about your criticism of the proposal to conduct a sample of the paper ledger era to determine whether the populations were essentially the same.  A. Correct.  Q. Okay. And you're familiar with the term initial hypothesis testing?  A. Yes.  Q. And so you understand that that's simply a first step that Interior's proposing to do.  A. That's my understanding.  Q. Based on your assumptions about the paper ledger era, it's fair to say you expect that initial hypothesis test to be rejected?  A. Again, it goes back to the definition of the error. If what you're looking for is an error and you're unlikely to find it, not finding it in the paper ledger era, and that happens to be the same as the electronic ledger era, I would anticipate that if you define the error high enough, you won't see it in either, and you could try to reach the conclusion that they're
2 3 4 02:40:50 5 6 7 8 9 02:41:02 10 11 12 13 14 02:41:16 15 16 17 18 19 02:41:29 20 21	supporting documents, but part of it does not. It's recomputed, it's third-party documents. So then when you drop down to category 2, you know it's not something that has a directly supporting document because it's already dropped all the way down to category 2.  So these are the kinds of things that you would anticipate, given it's not required to have a directly supporting document in order to do the reconciliation.  Q. But you've already told us you don't know what's required for an item to be reconciled with category 2. Right?  A. That's exactly what I testified to, but I know what it's not, and it's not a directly supporting document or it would be up in category 1.  Q. Okay. So what you're referring to, you're not really referring to no supporting documentation, you're talking about transactions that don't have what you call directly supporting documentation; is that right?  A. Right. It's the notion of an alternative procedure. It's not a supporting document. It's an alternative procedure.  Q. Okay. Let's go back to page 5 of your report, please.  Moving along. We're down to the seventh bullet point. And this	02:44:08	Let me ask one last thing. You did talk about your criticism of the proposal to conduct a sample of the paper ledger era to determine whether the populations were essentially the same.  A. Correct. Q. Okay. And you're familiar with the term initial hypothesis testing? A. Yes. Q. And so you understand that that's simply a first step that Interior's proposing to do. A. That's my understanding. Q. Based on your assumptions about the paper ledger era, it's fair to say you expect that initial hypothesis test to be rejected? A. Again, it goes back to the definition of the error. If what you're looking for is an error and you're unlikely to find it, not finding it in the paper ledger era, and that happens to be the same as the electronic ledger era, I would anticipate that if you define the error high enough, you won't see it in either, and you could try to reach the conclusion that they're the same.
2 3 4 02:40:50 5 6 7 8 9 02:41:02 10 11 12 13 14 02:41:16 15 16 17 18 19 02:41:29 20 21 22	supporting documents, but part of it does not. It's recomputed, it's third-party documents. So then when you drop down to category 2, you know it's not something that has a directly supporting document because it's already dropped all the way down to category 2.  So these are the kinds of things that you would anticipate, given it's not required to have a directly supporting document in order to do the reconciliation.  Q. But you've already told us you don't know what's required for an item to be reconciled with category 2. Right?  A. That's exactly what I testified to, but I know what it's not, and it's not a directly supporting document or it would be up in category 1.  Q. Okay. So what you're referring to, you're not really referring to no supporting documentation, you're talking about transactions that don't have what you call directly supporting documentation; is that right?  A. Right. It's the notion of an alternative procedure. It's not a supporting document. It's an alternative procedure.  Q. Okay. Let's go back to page 5 of your report, please.  Moving along. We're down to the seventh bullet point. And this is the one that talks about the plan does not constitute a	02:44:08	Let me ask one last thing. You did talk about your criticism of the proposal to conduct a sample of the paper ledger era to determine whether the populations were essentially the same.  A. Correct. Q. Okay. And you're familiar with the term initial hypothesis testing?  A. Yes. Q. And so you understand that that's simply a first step that Interior's proposing to do. A. That's my understanding. Q. Based on your assumptions about the paper ledger era, it's fair to say you expect that initial hypothesis test to be rejected? A. Again, it goes back to the definition of the error. If what you're looking for is an error and you're unlikely to find it, not finding it in the paper ledger era, and that happens to be the same as the electronic ledger era, I would anticipate that if you define the error high enough, you won't see it in either, and you could try to reach the conclusion that they're the same.  But it would be my expectation that if you were testing it
2 3 4 02:40:50 5 6 7 8 9 02:41:02 10 11 12 13 14 02:41:16 15 16 17 18 19 02:41:29 20 21 22 23	supporting documents, but part of it does not. It's recomputed, it's third-party documents. So then when you drop down to category 2, you know it's not something that has a directly supporting document because it's already dropped all the way down to category 2.  So these are the kinds of things that you would anticipate, given it's not required to have a directly supporting document in order to do the reconciliation.  Q. But you've already told us you don't know what's required for an item to be reconciled with category 2. Right?  A. That's exactly what I testified to, but I know what it's not, and it's not a directly supporting document or it would be up in category 1.  Q. Okay. So what you're referring to, you're not really referring to no supporting documentation, you're talking about transactions that don't have what you call directly supporting documentation; is that right?  A. Right. It's the notion of an alternative procedure. It's not a supporting document. It's an alternative procedure.  Q. Okay. Let's go back to page 5 of your report, please.  Moving along. We're down to the seventh bullet point. And this is the one that talks about the plan does not constitute a sufficient basis for making extrapolations beyond the population	02:44:08	Let me ask one last thing. You did talk about your criticism of the proposal to conduct a sample of the paper ledger era to determine whether the populations were essentially the same.  A. Correct. Q. Okay. And you're familiar with the term initial hypothesis testing?  A. Yes. Q. And so you understand that that's simply a first step that Interior's proposing to do. A. That's my understanding. Q. Based on your assumptions about the paper ledger era, it's fair to say you expect that initial hypothesis test to be rejected? A. Again, it goes back to the definition of the error. If what you're looking for is an error and you're unlikely to find it, not finding it in the paper ledger era, and that happens to be the same as the electronic ledger era, I would anticipate that if you define the error high enough, you won't see it in either, and you could try to reach the conclusion that they're the same.  But it would be my expectation that if you were testing it to talk about legitimately whether or not there's a difference
2 3 4 02:40:50 5 6 7 8 9 02:41:02 10 11 12 13 14 02:41:16 15 16 17 18 19 02:41:29 20 21 22 23 24	supporting documents, but part of it does not. It's recomputed, it's third-party documents. So then when you drop down to category 2, you know it's not something that has a directly supporting document because it's already dropped all the way down to category 2.  So these are the kinds of things that you would anticipate, given it's not required to have a directly supporting document in order to do the reconciliation.  Q. But you've already told us you don't know what's required for an item to be reconciled with category 2. Right?  A. That's exactly what I testified to, but I know what it's not, and it's not a directly supporting document or it would be up in category 1.  Q. Okay. So what you're referring to, you're not really referring to no supporting documentation, you're talking about transactions that don't have what you call directly supporting documentation; is that right?  A. Right. It's the notion of an alternative procedure. It's not a supporting document. It's an alternative procedure.  Q. Okay. Let's go back to page 5 of your report, please.  Moving along. We're down to the seventh bullet point. And this is the one that talks about the plan does not constitute a sufficient basis for making extrapolations beyond the population of recorded transactions in the electronic ledger era, subject	02:44:08	Let me ask one last thing. You did talk about your criticism of the proposal to conduct a sample of the paper ledger era to determine whether the populations were essentially the same.  A. Correct.  Q. Okay. And you're familiar with the term initial hypothesis testing?  A. Yes.  Q. And so you understand that that's simply a first step that Interior's proposing to do.  A. That's my understanding.  Q. Based on your assumptions about the paper ledger era, it's fair to say you expect that initial hypothesis test to be rejected?  A. Again, it goes back to the definition of the error. If what you're looking for is an error and you're unlikely to find it, not finding it in the paper ledger era, and that happens to be the same as the electronic ledger era, I would anticipate that if you define the error high enough, you won't see it in either, and you could try to reach the conclusion that they're the same.  But it would be my expectation that if you were testing it to talk about legitimately whether or not there's a difference in the supporting documents, you would find a substantial
2 3 4 02:40:50 5 6 7 8 9 02:41:02 10 11 12 13 14 02:41:16 15 16 17 18 19 02:41:29 20 21 22 23	supporting documents, but part of it does not. It's recomputed, it's third-party documents. So then when you drop down to category 2, you know it's not something that has a directly supporting document because it's already dropped all the way down to category 2.  So these are the kinds of things that you would anticipate, given it's not required to have a directly supporting document in order to do the reconciliation.  Q. But you've already told us you don't know what's required for an item to be reconciled with category 2. Right?  A. That's exactly what I testified to, but I know what it's not, and it's not a directly supporting document or it would be up in category 1.  Q. Okay. So what you're referring to, you're not really referring to no supporting documentation, you're talking about transactions that don't have what you call directly supporting documentation; is that right?  A. Right. It's the notion of an alternative procedure. It's not a supporting document. It's an alternative procedure.  Q. Okay. Let's go back to page 5 of your report, please.  Moving along. We're down to the seventh bullet point. And this is the one that talks about the plan does not constitute a sufficient basis for making extrapolations beyond the population of recorded transactions in the electronic ledger era, subject to DOI date restrictions.	02:44:08	Let me ask one last thing. You did talk about your criticism of the proposal to conduct a sample of the paper ledger era to determine whether the populations were essentially the same.  A. Correct.  Q. Okay. And you're familiar with the term initial hypothesis testing?  A. Yes.  Q. And so you understand that that's simply a first step that Interior's proposing to do.  A. That's my understanding.  Q. Based on your assumptions about the paper ledger era, it's fair to say you expect that initial hypothesis test to be rejected?  A. Again, it goes back to the definition of the error. If what you're looking for is an error and you're unlikely to find it, not finding it in the paper ledger era, and that happens to be the same as the electronic ledger era, I would anticipate that if you define the error high enough, you won't see it in either, and you could try to reach the conclusion that they're the same.  But it would be my expectation that if you were testing it to talk about legitimately whether or not there's a difference in the supporting documents, you would find a substantial difference between electronic and paper ledger eras.
2 3 4 4 02:40:50 5 6 7 8 9 02:41:02 10 11 12 13 14 02:41:16 15 16 17 18 19 02:41:29 20 21 22 23 24	supporting documents, but part of it does not. It's recomputed, it's third-party documents. So then when you drop down to category 2, you know it's not something that has a directly supporting document because it's already dropped all the way down to category 2.  So these are the kinds of things that you would anticipate, given it's not required to have a directly supporting document in order to do the reconciliation.  Q. But you've already told us you don't know what's required for an item to be reconciled with category 2. Right?  A. That's exactly what I testified to, but I know what it's not, and it's not a directly supporting document or it would be up in category 1.  Q. Okay. So what you're referring to, you're not really referring to no supporting documentation, you're talking about transactions that don't have what you call directly supporting documentation; is that right?  A. Right. It's the notion of an alternative procedure. It's not a supporting document. It's an alternative procedure.  Q. Okay. Let's go back to page 5 of your report, please.  Moving along. We're down to the seventh bullet point. And this is the one that talks about the plan does not constitute a sufficient basis for making extrapolations beyond the population of recorded transactions in the electronic ledger era, subject	02:44:08	Let me ask one last thing. You did talk about your criticism of the proposal to conduct a sample of the paper ledger era to determine whether the populations were essentially the same.  A. Correct.  Q. Okay. And you're familiar with the term initial hypothesis testing?  A. Yes.  Q. And so you understand that that's simply a first step that Interior's proposing to do.  A. That's my understanding.  Q. Based on your assumptions about the paper ledger era, it's fair to say you expect that initial hypothesis test to be rejected?  A. Again, it goes back to the definition of the error. If what you're looking for is an error and you're unlikely to find it, not finding it in the paper ledger era, and that happens to be the same as the electronic ledger era, I would anticipate that if you define the error high enough, you won't see it in either, and you could try to reach the conclusion that they're the same.  But it would be my expectation that if you were testing it to talk about legitimately whether or not there's a difference in the supporting documents, you would find a substantial

	4540		4544
_	1512		1514
1	Q. Okay. Well, let's step back from whether you believe	1	A. Yes.
2	Interior is acting legitimately, whether you believe they're	2	Q. Now, you did not consider, for example, and let's take
3	setting the standards too high for an error. I ask you to	3	Rocky Mountain Region in the 4486. You didn't consider that if
4	assume that the way errors are being defined are proper and	4	Rocky Mountain Region actually went on IRMS in 1976, you didn't
02:45:23 <b>5</b>	consistent with the standards that accountants would employ in	02:48:20 <b>5</b>	consider the near decade of purged documents on a monthly basis,
6	this situation. Based on what you understand, your beliefs	6	did you?
7	about the conditions of paper records, you expect the initial	7	A. I did not. I simply started with what the DCV identified
8	hypothesis to be rejected, right?	8	as the missing months.
9	A. I would.	9	Q. So when you're looking at this number, when you're looking
02:45:39 10	Q. Okay. And in that case, do you remember what Interior's	02:48:35 10	at the total number of missing months data, you're dealing with
11	proposed to do if the initial hypothesis is rejected?	11	it from still a narrow time period, correct?
12	A. Back to the drawing board and draw bigger samples.	12	A. Correct.
13	Q. Thank you.	13	Q. You're not dealing with IRMS once it actually became
14	MR. WARSHAWSKY: Your Honor, I have no more cross.	14	implemented in the various agencies or regional offices,
02:45:52 15	Thank you, Mr. Duncan.	02:48:50 15	correct?
16	THE WITNESS: You're welcome.	16	A. That's correct.
17	MR. GINGOLD: A brief redirect, Your Honor.	17	Q. So your estimate is what it is, for a period of time,
18	REDIRECT EXAMINATION	18	excluding nearly a decade in some respect of missing data,
19	BY MR. GINGOLD:	19	correct?
02:46:03 <b>20</b>		02:49:00 20	_
	Q. I'd like to call up Bates No. 152-4 at 17, which relates to		A. At least in that one agency. It could be more or less in
21	Mr. Warshawsky's discussion of Plaintiffs' 4486, which is the	21	other agencies, but it's simply limited to the missing months
22	estimated missing transactions throughput from October 1, 1984.	22	identified by the DCV.
23	As you can see, Mr. Duncan, this is the FTI report. And I'd	23	Q. And the DCV is not complete, is it?
24	like to go to 17. Have you seen this before?	24	A. No, it is not.
02:46:31 <b>25</b>	A. Yes, I have.	02:49:13 <b>25</b>	<b>Q.</b> And the land-to-dollar testing is not complete, is it?
	Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR		Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
	Official Court Reporter		Official Court Reporter
	Smolal Court (Coporto)		Official Godit (Ceporter
	1513		1515
1	<u>'</u>	1	<u>'</u>
1 2	1513	1 2	1515
_	1513 <b>Q.</b> Isn't this tab B-2 you're referring to in footnote 7 of	_	A. Not to my knowledge.
2	1513  Q. Isn't this tab B-2 you're referring to in footnote 7 of Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4486?	2	A. Not to my knowledge. Q. And you were asked specifically questions about the
3	Q. Isn't this tab B-2 you're referring to in footnote 7 of Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4486?  A. Yes. This is the table.	3	A. Not to my knowledge.  Q. And you were asked specifically questions about the Reference Manual For Scientific Evidence, weren't you?
2 3 4	Q. Isn't this tab B-2 you're referring to in footnote 7 of Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4486?  A. Yes. This is the table.  Q. And if you can focus in a little bit, you're looking at	2 3 4	A. Not to my knowledge.  Q. And you were asked specifically questions about the Reference Manual For Scientific Evidence, weren't you?  A. Yes, I was.
2 3 4 02:46:52 5	Q. Isn't this tab B-2 you're referring to in footnote 7 of Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4486?  A. Yes. This is the table.  Q. And if you can focus in a little bit, you're looking at I'm not looking at that paragraph, excuse me. You're looking	2 3 4 02:49:24 <b>5</b>	A. Not to my knowledge.  Q. And you were asked specifically questions about the Reference Manual For Scientific Evidence, weren't you?  A. Yes, I was.  Q. One of the I'm not going to put this up, but on page 90
2 3 4 02:46:52 5 6	Q. Isn't this tab B-2 you're referring to in footnote 7 of Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4486?  A. Yes. This is the table.  Q. And if you can focus in a little bit, you're looking at I'm not looking at that paragraph, excuse me. You're looking at if we can just have the upper part of this a little bit so	2 3 4 02:49:24 5 6	A. Not to my knowledge.  Q. And you were asked specifically questions about the Reference Manual For Scientific Evidence, weren't you?  A. Yes, I was.  Q. One of the I'm not going to put this up, but on page 90 of the reference manual, there's a statement regarding when
2 3 4 02:46:52 5 6 7	Q. Isn't this tab B-2 you're referring to in footnote 7 of Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4486?  A. Yes. This is the table.  Q. And if you can focus in a little bit, you're looking at I'm not looking at that paragraph, excuse me. You're looking at if we can just have the upper part of this a little bit so we can have some clarity. I'm sorry.	2 3 4 02:49:24 5 6 7	A. Not to my knowledge.  Q. And you were asked specifically questions about the Reference Manual For Scientific Evidence, weren't you?  A. Yes, I was.  Q. One of the I'm not going to put this up, but on page 90 of the reference manual, there's a statement regarding when inferences can be made, correct?
2 3 4 02:46:52 5 6 7 8 9	Q. Isn't this tab B-2 you're referring to in footnote 7 of Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4486? A. Yes. This is the table. Q. And if you can focus in a little bit, you're looking at I'm not looking at that paragraph, excuse me. You're looking at if we can just have the upper part of this a little bit so we can have some clarity. I'm sorry. Okay. We're looking at control tests and we're looking at	2 3 4 02:49:24 5 6 7 8 9	A. Not to my knowledge.  Q. And you were asked specifically questions about the Reference Manual For Scientific Evidence, weren't you?  A. Yes, I was.  Q. One of the I'm not going to put this up, but on page 90 of the reference manual, there's a statement regarding when inferences can be made, correct?  A. I don't recall page 90 specifically. It's a large manual.  MR. WARSHAWSKY: Your Honor, we should pull it up.
2 3 4 02:46:52 5 6 7 8	Q. Isn't this tab B-2 you're referring to in footnote 7 of Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4486?  A. Yes. This is the table.  Q. And if you can focus in a little bit, you're looking at I'm not looking at that paragraph, excuse me. You're looking at if we can just have the upper part of this a little bit so we can have some clarity. I'm sorry.  Okay. We're looking at control tests and we're looking at missing months, aren't we? Does this, part of it, provide that?	2 3 4 02:49:24 5 6 7 8	A. Not to my knowledge.  Q. And you were asked specifically questions about the Reference Manual For Scientific Evidence, weren't you?  A. Yes, I was.  Q. One of the I'm not going to put this up, but on page 90 of the reference manual, there's a statement regarding when inferences can be made, correct?  A. I don't recall page 90 specifically. It's a large manual.
2 3 4 02:46:52 5 6 7 8 9 02:47:16 10	Q. Isn't this tab B-2 you're referring to in footnote 7 of Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4486?  A. Yes. This is the table.  Q. And if you can focus in a little bit, you're looking at I'm not looking at that paragraph, excuse me. You're looking at if we can just have the upper part of this a little bit so we can have some clarity. I'm sorry.  Okay. We're looking at control tests and we're looking at missing months, aren't we? Does this, part of it, provide that?  A. Yes.	2 3 4 02:49:24 5 6 7 8 9 02:49:45 10	A. Not to my knowledge.  Q. And you were asked specifically questions about the Reference Manual For Scientific Evidence, weren't you?  A. Yes, I was.  Q. One of the I'm not going to put this up, but on page 90 of the reference manual, there's a statement regarding when inferences can be made, correct?  A. I don't recall page 90 specifically. It's a large manual.  MR. WARSHAWSKY: Your Honor, we should pull it up.  MR. GINGOLD: This should be a short question,
2 3 4 02:46:52 5 6 7 8 9 02:47:16 10 11	Q. Isn't this tab B-2 you're referring to in footnote 7 of Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4486?  A. Yes. This is the table. Q. And if you can focus in a little bit, you're looking at I'm not looking at that paragraph, excuse me. You're looking at if we can just have the upper part of this a little bit so we can have some clarity. I'm sorry.  Okay. We're looking at control tests and we're looking at missing months, aren't we? Does this, part of it, provide that?  A. Yes. Q. Okay. So you're dealing with missing months, correct?  A. Correct.	2 3 4 02:49:24 5 6 7 8 9 02:49:45 10 11	A. Not to my knowledge.  Q. And you were asked specifically questions about the Reference Manual For Scientific Evidence, weren't you?  A. Yes, I was.  Q. One of the I'm not going to put this up, but on page 90 of the reference manual, there's a statement regarding when inferences can be made, correct?  A. I don't recall page 90 specifically. It's a large manual.  MR. WARSHAWSKY: Your Honor, we should pull it up.  MR. GINGOLD: This should be a short question,
2 3 4 02:46:52 5 6 7 8 9 02:47:16 10 11 12 13	Q. Isn't this tab B-2 you're referring to in footnote 7 of Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4486?  A. Yes. This is the table.  Q. And if you can focus in a little bit, you're looking at I'm not looking at that paragraph, excuse me. You're looking at if we can just have the upper part of this a little bit so we can have some clarity. I'm sorry.  Okay. We're looking at control tests and we're looking at missing months, aren't we? Does this, part of it, provide that?  A. Yes.  Q. Okay. So you're dealing with missing months, correct?  A. Correct.  Q. And footnote 7 says some of footnote 7 in Plaintiff's	2 3 4 02:49:24 5 6 7 8 9 02:49:45 10 11 12 13	A. Not to my knowledge.  Q. And you were asked specifically questions about the Reference Manual For Scientific Evidence, weren't you?  A. Yes, I was.  Q. One of the I'm not going to put this up, but on page 90 of the reference manual, there's a statement regarding when inferences can be made, correct?  A. I don't recall page 90 specifically. It's a large manual.  MR. WARSHAWSKY: Your Honor, we should pull it up.  MR. GINGOLD: This should be a short question, Your Honor.  BY MR. GINGOLD:  Q. Is this a fair statement made in the manual: Inferences
2 3 4 02:46:52 5 6 7 8 9 02:47:16 10 11 12 13	Q. Isn't this tab B-2 you're referring to in footnote 7 of Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4486?  A. Yes. This is the table. Q. And if you can focus in a little bit, you're looking at I'm not looking at that paragraph, excuse me. You're looking at if we can just have the upper part of this a little bit so we can have some clarity. I'm sorry. Okay. We're looking at control tests and we're looking at missing months, aren't we? Does this, part of it, provide that?  A. Yes. Q. Okay. So you're dealing with missing months, correct? A. Correct. Q. And footnote 7 says some of footnote 7 in Plaintiff's Exhibit 4486 states the sum of tab B-2 regional reports for	2 3 4 02:49:24 5 6 7 8 9 02:49:45 10 11 12 13 14	A. Not to my knowledge.  Q. And you were asked specifically questions about the Reference Manual For Scientific Evidence, weren't you?  A. Yes, I was.  Q. One of the I'm not going to put this up, but on page 90 of the reference manual, there's a statement regarding when inferences can be made, correct?  A. I don't recall page 90 specifically. It's a large manual.  MR. WARSHAWSKY: Your Honor, we should pull it up.  MR. GINGOLD: This should be a short question,  Your Honor.  BY MR. GINGOLD:  Q. Is this a fair statement made in the manual: Inferences from part to the whole are justified only when the sample is
2 3 4 02:46:52 5 6 7 8 9 02:47:16 10 11 12 13 14 02:47:31 15	Q. Isn't this tab B-2 you're referring to in footnote 7 of Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4486?  A. Yes. This is the table. Q. And if you can focus in a little bit, you're looking at I'm not looking at that paragraph, excuse me. You're looking at if we can just have the upper part of this a little bit so we can have some clarity. I'm sorry. Okay. We're looking at control tests and we're looking at missing months, aren't we? Does this, part of it, provide that?  A. Yes. Q. Okay. So you're dealing with missing months, correct? A. Correct. Q. And footnote 7 says some of footnote 7 in Plaintiff's Exhibit 4486 states the sum of tab B-2 regional reports for months prior to IRMS conversion and missing months after IRMS	2 3 4 02:49:24 5 6 7 8 9 02:49:45 10 11 12 13 14 02:49:53 15	A. Not to my knowledge.  Q. And you were asked specifically questions about the Reference Manual For Scientific Evidence, weren't you?  A. Yes, I was.  Q. One of the I'm not going to put this up, but on page 90 of the reference manual, there's a statement regarding when inferences can be made, correct?  A. I don't recall page 90 specifically. It's a large manual.  MR. WARSHAWSKY: Your Honor, we should pull it up.  MR. GINGOLD: This should be a short question, Your Honor.  BY MR. GINGOLD:  Q. Is this a fair statement made in the manual: Inferences from part to the whole are justified only when the sample is representative?
2 3 4 02:46:52 5 6 7 8 9 02:47:16 10 11 12 13 14 02:47:31 15 16	Q. Isn't this tab B-2 you're referring to in footnote 7 of Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4486?  A. Yes. This is the table.  Q. And if you can focus in a little bit, you're looking at I'm not looking at that paragraph, excuse me. You're looking at if we can just have the upper part of this a little bit so we can have some clarity. I'm sorry.  Okay. We're looking at control tests and we're looking at missing months, aren't we? Does this, part of it, provide that?  A. Yes.  Q. Okay. So you're dealing with missing months, correct?  A. Correct.  Q. And footnote 7 says some of footnote 7 in Plaintiff's Exhibit 4486 states the sum of tab B-2 regional reports for months prior to IRMS conversion and missing months after IRMS conversion, correct?	2 3 4 02:49:24 5 6 7 8 9 02:49:45 10 11 12 13 14 02:49:53 15 16	A. Not to my knowledge.  Q. And you were asked specifically questions about the Reference Manual For Scientific Evidence, weren't you?  A. Yes, I was.  Q. One of the I'm not going to put this up, but on page 90 of the reference manual, there's a statement regarding when inferences can be made, correct?  A. I don't recall page 90 specifically. It's a large manual.  MR. WARSHAWSKY: Your Honor, we should pull it up.  MR. GINGOLD: This should be a short question, Your Honor.  BY MR. GINGOLD:  Q. Is this a fair statement made in the manual: Inferences from part to the whole are justified only when the sample is representative?  A. That would be the kind of statement in the scientific
2 3 4 02:46:52 5 6 7 8 9 02:47:16 10 11 12 13 14 02:47:31 15 16 17	Q. Isn't this tab B-2 you're referring to in footnote 7 of Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4486?  A. Yes. This is the table. Q. And if you can focus in a little bit, you're looking at I'm not looking at that paragraph, excuse me. You're looking at if we can just have the upper part of this a little bit so we can have some clarity. I'm sorry.  Okay. We're looking at control tests and we're looking at missing months, aren't we? Does this, part of it, provide that?  A. Yes. Q. Okay. So you're dealing with missing months, correct? A. Correct. Q. And footnote 7 says some of footnote 7 in Plaintiff's Exhibit 4486 states the sum of tab B-2 regional reports for months prior to IRMS conversion and missing months after IRMS conversion, correct?  A. Correct.	2 3 4 02:49:24 5 6 7 8 9 02:49:45 10 11 12 13 14 02:49:53 15 16 17	A. Not to my knowledge.  Q. And you were asked specifically questions about the Reference Manual For Scientific Evidence, weren't you?  A. Yes, I was.  Q. One of the I'm not going to put this up, but on page 90 of the reference manual, there's a statement regarding when inferences can be made, correct?  A. I don't recall page 90 specifically. It's a large manual.  MR. WARSHAWSKY: Your Honor, we should pull it up.  MR. GINGOLD: This should be a short question, Your Honor.  BY MR. GINGOLD:  Q. Is this a fair statement made in the manual: Inferences from part to the whole are justified only when the sample is representative?  A. That would be the kind of statement in the scientific manual, yes.
2 3 4 02:46:52 5 6 7 8 9 02:47:16 10 11 12 13 14 02:47:31 15 16 17 18	Q. Isn't this tab B-2 you're referring to in footnote 7 of Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4486?  A. Yes. This is the table. Q. And if you can focus in a little bit, you're looking at I'm not looking at that paragraph, excuse me. You're looking at if we can just have the upper part of this a little bit so we can have some clarity. I'm sorry. Okay. We're looking at control tests and we're looking at missing months, aren't we? Does this, part of it, provide that?  A. Yes. Q. Okay. So you're dealing with missing months, correct? A. Correct. Q. And footnote 7 says some of footnote 7 in Plaintiff's Exhibit 4486 states the sum of tab B-2 regional reports for months prior to IRMS conversion and missing months after IRMS conversion, correct?  A. Correct. Q. And you're stating this as an estimate, correct?	2 3 4 02:49:24 5 6 7 8 9 02:49:45 10 11 12 13 14 02:49:53 15 16 17 18	A. Not to my knowledge.  Q. And you were asked specifically questions about the Reference Manual For Scientific Evidence, weren't you?  A. Yes, I was.  Q. One of the I'm not going to put this up, but on page 90 of the reference manual, there's a statement regarding when inferences can be made, correct?  A. I don't recall page 90 specifically. It's a large manual.  MR. WARSHAWSKY: Your Honor, we should pull it up.  MR. GINGOLD: This should be a short question, Your Honor.  BY MR. GINGOLD:  Q. Is this a fair statement made in the manual: Inferences from part to the whole are justified only when the sample is representative?  A. That would be the kind of statement in the scientific manual, yes.  Q. And one of your concerns with regard to your opinion is
2 3 4 02:46:52 5 6 7 8 9 02:47:16 10 11 12 13 14 02:47:31 15 16 17 18 19	Q. Isn't this tab B-2 you're referring to in footnote 7 of Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4486?  A. Yes. This is the table. Q. And if you can focus in a little bit, you're looking at I'm not looking at that paragraph, excuse me. You're looking at if we can just have the upper part of this a little bit so we can have some clarity. I'm sorry.  Okay. We're looking at control tests and we're looking at missing months, aren't we? Does this, part of it, provide that?  A. Yes. Q. Okay. So you're dealing with missing months, correct?  A. Correct. Q. And footnote 7 says some of footnote 7 in Plaintiff's Exhibit 4486 states the sum of tab B-2 regional reports for months prior to IRMS conversion and missing months after IRMS conversion, correct?  A. Correct. Q. And you're stating this as an estimate, correct?  A. It is.	2 3 4 02:49:24 5 6 7 8 9 02:49:45 10 11 12 13 14 02:49:53 15 16 17 18 19	A. Not to my knowledge.  Q. And you were asked specifically questions about the Reference Manual For Scientific Evidence, weren't you?  A. Yes, I was.  Q. One of the I'm not going to put this up, but on page 90 of the reference manual, there's a statement regarding when inferences can be made, correct?  A. I don't recall page 90 specifically. It's a large manual.  MR. WARSHAWSKY: Your Honor, we should pull it up.  MR. GINGOLD: This should be a short question, Your Honor.  BY MR. GINGOLD:  Q. Is this a fair statement made in the manual: Inferences from part to the whole are justified only when the sample is representative?  A. That would be the kind of statement in the scientific manual, yes.  Q. And one of your concerns with regard to your opinion is that the sample is not representative of the target population,
2 3 4 02:46:52 5 6 7 8 9 02:47:16 10 11 12 13 14 02:47:31 15 16 17 18 19 02:47:40 20	Q. Isn't this tab B-2 you're referring to in footnote 7 of Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4486?  A. Yes. This is the table. Q. And if you can focus in a little bit, you're looking at I'm not looking at that paragraph, excuse me. You're looking at if we can just have the upper part of this a little bit so we can have some clarity. I'm sorry.  Okay. We're looking at control tests and we're looking at missing months, aren't we? Does this, part of it, provide that?  A. Yes. Q. Okay. So you're dealing with missing months, correct? A. Correct. Q. And footnote 7 says some of footnote 7 in Plaintiff's Exhibit 4486 states the sum of tab B-2 regional reports for months prior to IRMS conversion and missing months after IRMS conversion, correct?  A. Correct. Q. And you're stating this as an estimate, correct? A. It is. Q. Based on the missing months identified in the DCV, correct?	2 3 4 02:49:24 5 6 7 8 9 02:49:45 10 11 12 13 14 02:49:53 15 16 17 18 19 02:50:01 20	A. Not to my knowledge.  Q. And you were asked specifically questions about the Reference Manual For Scientific Evidence, weren't you?  A. Yes, I was.  Q. One of the I'm not going to put this up, but on page 90 of the reference manual, there's a statement regarding when inferences can be made, correct?  A. I don't recall page 90 specifically. It's a large manual.  MR. WARSHAWSKY: Your Honor, we should pull it up.  MR. GINGOLD: This should be a short question, Your Honor.  BY MR. GINGOLD:  Q. Is this a fair statement made in the manual: Inferences from part to the whole are justified only when the sample is representative?  A. That would be the kind of statement in the scientific manual, yes.  Q. And one of your concerns with regard to your opinion is that the sample is not representative of the target population, correct?
2 3 4 02:46:52 5 6 7 8 9 02:47:16 10 11 12 13 14 02:47:31 15 16 17 18 19 02:47:40 20 21	Q. Isn't this tab B-2 you're referring to in footnote 7 of Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4486?  A. Yes. This is the table. Q. And if you can focus in a little bit, you're looking at I'm not looking at that paragraph, excuse me. You're looking at if we can just have the upper part of this a little bit so we can have some clarity. I'm sorry.  Okay. We're looking at control tests and we're looking at missing months, aren't we? Does this, part of it, provide that?  A. Yes. Q. Okay. So you're dealing with missing months, correct? A. Correct. Q. And footnote 7 says some of footnote 7 in Plaintiff's Exhibit 4486 states the sum of tab B-2 regional reports for months prior to IRMS conversion and missing months after IRMS conversion, correct?  A. Correct. Q. And you're stating this as an estimate, correct? A. It is. Q. Based on the missing months identified in the DCV, correct? A. It is based on exactly that.	2 3 4 02:49:24 5 6 7 8 9 02:49:45 10 11 12 13 14 02:49:53 15 16 17 18 19 02:50:01 20 21	A. Not to my knowledge.  Q. And you were asked specifically questions about the Reference Manual For Scientific Evidence, weren't you?  A. Yes, I was.  Q. One of the I'm not going to put this up, but on page 90 of the reference manual, there's a statement regarding when inferences can be made, correct?  A. I don't recall page 90 specifically. It's a large manual.  MR. WARSHAWSKY: Your Honor, we should pull it up.  MR. GINGOLD: This should be a short question, Your Honor.  BY MR. GINGOLD:  Q. Is this a fair statement made in the manual: Inferences from part to the whole are justified only when the sample is representative?  A. That would be the kind of statement in the scientific manual, yes.  Q. And one of your concerns with regard to your opinion is that the sample is not representative of the target population, correct?  A. That's been my concern since I first started looking at
2 3 4 02:46:52 5 6 7 8 9 02:47:16 10 11 12 13 14 02:47:31 15 16 17 18 19 02:47:40 20 21 22	Q. Isn't this tab B-2 you're referring to in footnote 7 of Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4486?  A. Yes. This is the table. Q. And if you can focus in a little bit, you're looking at I'm not looking at that paragraph, excuse me. You're looking at if we can just have the upper part of this a little bit so we can have some clarity. I'm sorry.  Okay. We're looking at control tests and we're looking at missing months, aren't we? Does this, part of it, provide that?  A. Yes. Q. Okay. So you're dealing with missing months, correct? A. Correct. Q. And footnote 7 says some of footnote 7 in Plaintiff's Exhibit 4486 states the sum of tab B-2 regional reports for months prior to IRMS conversion and missing months after IRMS conversion, correct?  A. Correct. Q. And you're stating this as an estimate, correct? A. It is. Q. Based on the missing months identified in the DCV, correct? A. It is based on exactly that. Q. And one of the questions that was asked by Mr. Warshawsky	2 3 4 02:49:24 5 6 7 8 9 02:49:45 10 11 12 13 14 02:49:53 15 16 17 18 19 02:50:01 20 21 22	A. Not to my knowledge.  Q. And you were asked specifically questions about the Reference Manual For Scientific Evidence, weren't you?  A. Yes, I was.  Q. One of the I'm not going to put this up, but on page 90 of the reference manual, there's a statement regarding when inferences can be made, correct?  A. I don't recall page 90 specifically. It's a large manual.  MR. WARSHAWSKY: Your Honor, we should pull it up.  MR. GINGOLD: This should be a short question, Your Honor.  BY MR. GINGOLD:  Q. Is this a fair statement made in the manual: Inferences from part to the whole are justified only when the sample is representative?  A. That would be the kind of statement in the scientific manual, yes.  Q. And one of your concerns with regard to your opinion is that the sample is not representative of the target population, correct?  A. That's been my concern since I first started looking at this.
2 3 4 02:46:52 5 6 7 8 9 02:47:16 10 11 12 13 14 02:47:31 15 16 17 18 19 02:47:40 20 21 22 23	Q. Isn't this tab B-2 you're referring to in footnote 7 of Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4486?  A. Yes. This is the table. Q. And if you can focus in a little bit, you're looking at I'm not looking at that paragraph, excuse me. You're looking at if we can just have the upper part of this a little bit so we can have some clarity. I'm sorry.  Okay. We're looking at control tests and we're looking at missing months, aren't we? Does this, part of it, provide that?  A. Yes. Q. Okay. So you're dealing with missing months, correct?  A. Correct. Q. And footnote 7 says some of footnote 7 in Plaintiff's Exhibit 4486 states the sum of tab B-2 regional reports for months prior to IRMS conversion and missing months after IRMS conversion, correct?  A. Correct. Q. And you're stating this as an estimate, correct?  A. It is. Q. Based on the missing months identified in the DCV, correct? A. It is based on exactly that. Q. And one of the questions that was asked by Mr. Warshawsky is whether or not you properly considered the missing months if	2 3 4 02:49:24 5 6 7 8 9 02:49:45 10 11 12 13 14 02:49:53 15 16 17 18 19 02:50:01 20 21 22 23	A. Not to my knowledge.  Q. And you were asked specifically questions about the Reference Manual For Scientific Evidence, weren't you?  A. Yes, I was.  Q. One of the I'm not going to put this up, but on page 90 of the reference manual, there's a statement regarding when inferences can be made, correct?  A. I don't recall page 90 specifically. It's a large manual.  MR. WARSHAWSKY: Your Honor, we should pull it up.  MR. GINGOLD: This should be a short question, Your Honor.  BY MR. GINGOLD:  Q. Is this a fair statement made in the manual: Inferences from part to the whole are justified only when the sample is representative?  A. That would be the kind of statement in the scientific manual, yes.  Q. And one of your concerns with regard to your opinion is that the sample is not representative of the target population, correct?  A. That's been my concern since I first started looking at this.  Q. Therefore, your opinion remains the same; if in fact the
2 3 4 02:46:52 5 6 7 8 9 02:47:16 10 11 12 13 14 02:47:31 15 16 17 18 19 02:47:40 20 21 22 23 24	Q. Isn't this tab B-2 you're referring to in footnote 7 of Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4486?  A. Yes. This is the table. Q. And if you can focus in a little bit, you're looking at I'm not looking at that paragraph, excuse me. You're looking at if we can just have the upper part of this a little bit so we can have some clarity. I'm sorry.  Okay. We're looking at control tests and we're looking at missing months, aren't we? Does this, part of it, provide that?  A. Yes. Q. Okay. So you're dealing with missing months, correct? A. Correct. Q. And footnote 7 says some of footnote 7 in Plaintiff's Exhibit 4486 states the sum of tab B-2 regional reports for months prior to IRMS conversion and missing months after IRMS conversion, correct? A. Correct. Q. And you're stating this as an estimate, correct? A. It is. Q. Based on the missing months identified in the DCV, correct? A. It is based on exactly that. Q. And one of the questions that was asked by Mr. Warshawsky is whether or not you properly considered the missing months if all the agencies or regional offices didn't start as of your	2 3 4 02:49:24 5 6 7 8 9 02:49:45 10 11 12 13 14 02:49:53 15 16 17 18 19 02:50:01 20 21 22 23 24	A. Not to my knowledge.  Q. And you were asked specifically questions about the Reference Manual For Scientific Evidence, weren't you?  A. Yes, I was.  Q. One of the I'm not going to put this up, but on page 90 of the reference manual, there's a statement regarding when inferences can be made, correct?  A. I don't recall page 90 specifically. It's a large manual.  MR. WARSHAWSKY: Your Honor, we should pull it up.  MR. GINGOLD: This should be a short question, Your Honor.  BY MR. GINGOLD:  Q. Is this a fair statement made in the manual: Inferences from part to the whole are justified only when the sample is representative?  A. That would be the kind of statement in the scientific manual, yes.  Q. And one of your concerns with regard to your opinion is that the sample is not representative of the target population, correct?  A. That's been my concern since I first started looking at this.  Q. Therefore, your opinion remains the same; if in fact the sample is taken for the purpose of establishing accurate account
2 3 4 02:46:52 5 6 7 8 9 02:47:16 10 11 12 13 14 02:47:31 15 16 17 18 19 02:47:40 20 21 22 23	Q. Isn't this tab B-2 you're referring to in footnote 7 of Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4486?  A. Yes. This is the table. Q. And if you can focus in a little bit, you're looking at I'm not looking at that paragraph, excuse me. You're looking at if we can just have the upper part of this a little bit so we can have some clarity. I'm sorry.  Okay. We're looking at control tests and we're looking at missing months, aren't we? Does this, part of it, provide that?  A. Yes. Q. Okay. So you're dealing with missing months, correct?  A. Correct. Q. And footnote 7 says some of footnote 7 in Plaintiff's Exhibit 4486 states the sum of tab B-2 regional reports for months prior to IRMS conversion and missing months after IRMS conversion, correct?  A. Correct. Q. And you're stating this as an estimate, correct?  A. It is. Q. Based on the missing months identified in the DCV, correct? A. It is based on exactly that. Q. And one of the questions that was asked by Mr. Warshawsky is whether or not you properly considered the missing months if	2 3 4 02:49:24 5 6 7 8 9 02:49:45 10 11 12 13 14 02:49:53 15 16 17 18 19 02:50:01 20 21 22 23	A. Not to my knowledge.  Q. And you were asked specifically questions about the Reference Manual For Scientific Evidence, weren't you?  A. Yes, I was.  Q. One of the I'm not going to put this up, but on page 90 of the reference manual, there's a statement regarding when inferences can be made, correct?  A. I don't recall page 90 specifically. It's a large manual.  MR. WARSHAWSKY: Your Honor, we should pull it up.  MR. GINGOLD: This should be a short question, Your Honor.  BY MR. GINGOLD:  Q. Is this a fair statement made in the manual: Inferences from part to the whole are justified only when the sample is representative?  A. That would be the kind of statement in the scientific manual, yes.  Q. And one of your concerns with regard to your opinion is that the sample is not representative of the target population, correct?  A. That's been my concern since I first started looking at this.  Q. Therefore, your opinion remains the same; if in fact the
2 3 4 02:46:52 5 6 7 8 9 02:47:16 10 11 12 13 14 02:47:31 15 16 17 18 19 02:47:40 20 21 22 23 24	Q. Isn't this tab B-2 you're referring to in footnote 7 of Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4486?  A. Yes. This is the table. Q. And if you can focus in a little bit, you're looking at I'm not looking at that paragraph, excuse me. You're looking at if we can just have the upper part of this a little bit so we can have some clarity. I'm sorry.  Okay. We're looking at control tests and we're looking at missing months, aren't we? Does this, part of it, provide that?  A. Yes. Q. Okay. So you're dealing with missing months, correct? A. Correct. Q. And footnote 7 says some of footnote 7 in Plaintiff's Exhibit 4486 states the sum of tab B-2 regional reports for months prior to IRMS conversion and missing months after IRMS conversion, correct? A. Correct. Q. And you're stating this as an estimate, correct? A. It is. Q. Based on the missing months identified in the DCV, correct? A. It is based on exactly that. Q. And one of the questions that was asked by Mr. Warshawsky is whether or not you properly considered the missing months if all the agencies or regional offices didn't start as of your	2 3 4 02:49:24 5 6 7 8 9 02:49:45 10 11 12 13 14 02:49:53 15 16 17 18 19 02:50:01 20 21 22 23 24	A. Not to my knowledge.  Q. And you were asked specifically questions about the Reference Manual For Scientific Evidence, weren't you?  A. Yes, I was.  Q. One of the I'm not going to put this up, but on page 90 of the reference manual, there's a statement regarding when inferences can be made, correct?  A. I don't recall page 90 specifically. It's a large manual.  MR. WARSHAWSKY: Your Honor, we should pull it up.  MR. GINGOLD: This should be a short question, Your Honor.  BY MR. GINGOLD:  Q. Is this a fair statement made in the manual: Inferences from part to the whole are justified only when the sample is representative?  A. That would be the kind of statement in the scientific manual, yes.  Q. And one of your concerns with regard to your opinion is that the sample is not representative of the target population, correct?  A. That's been my concern since I first started looking at this.  Q. Therefore, your opinion remains the same; if in fact the sample is taken for the purpose of establishing accurate account

	1516		1518
1	beneficiaries, it is not representative, is it?	1	<b>Q.</b> If we could look on the screen at Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4210.
2	A. The sample cannot be used to make a statement about that	2	And this is then the cover page of your expert report?
3	population.	3	A. Yes.
4	Q. And Mr. Duncan, none of your opinions have changed as a	4	Q. And let's look over at the third page, please, sir. And if
02:50:23 <b>5</b>	result of the cross-examination by Mr. Warshawsky, have they?	02:54:40 <b>5</b>	you would blow up toward the bottom where it has Roman III,
6	A. No, they have not.	6	qualifications. And is this then where you have set forth your
7	MR. GINGOLD: Thank you.	7	qualifications here?
8	THE COURT: I think you're excused, Mr. Duncan. Thank	8	A. Yes.
9	you.	9	Q. And it briefly summarizes what I had told the Court about
02:50:41 10	THE WITNESS: Thank you, Your Honor.	02:55:01 10	your work in both the public service with the Office of the
11	(The witness steps down.)	11	Comptroller of the Currency, and also your work in the private
12	THE COURT: Do you have a 25-minute witness this	12	sector, if we can go over to the top of the next page. And the
13	afternoon, or do you all want to go home?	13	top there pause for a moment for the Court to look and it
14	MR. DORRIS: Our next witness is Mr. Homan. We can't	14	also then, the paragraph there talks about your work as a
02:50:54 15	complete him in 25 minutes, but we can certainly start him if	02:55:32 15	special trustee for American Indians. And were you the first
16	that's what you'd prefer to do.	16	such special trustee pursuant to the 1994 Act?
17	THE COURT: How long is Mr. Homan's direct?	17	A. Yes.
18	MR. DORRIS: I would say it's about an hour and 45	18	Q. All right. And then at the end, it indicates that there
19	minutes.	19	is you have a resume which is attached as Exhibit 3 to this
02:51:03 <b>20</b>	THE COURT: Let's get started.	02:55:51 <b>20</b>	report. And let's look at that. If we go to page 390 of
21	MR. DORRIS: We call Paul Homan.	21	Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4210. And if we'd look at the next page,
22	THE COURT: All right.	22	please. And is this a copy of your resume where you have
23	MR. DORRIS: Your Honor, we're going to cover several	23	that you prepared?
24	areas with Mr. Homan. He was the first special trustee from	24	A. Yes, I did.
02:51:58 <b>25</b>	September of 1995 to January of 1999 pursuant to the 1994 Act,	02:56:18 <b>25</b>	Q. And you list first, kind of going back in time, the work
	Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR		Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
	Official Court Reporter		Official Court Reporter
	1517		1519
1	after he had been with the Office of the Comptroller of the	1	that you've done as an expert consultant, and then on the next
2	Currency and then in the private sector involved in five or six	2	page, if we can blow that up, your work where you had turnaround
3	turn-around situations with major financial institutions.	3	planning and experience, and then you go on and list three on
4	We'll be covering primarily five areas: the principal	4	this page, including Riggs National Bank here in Washington,
02:52:30 <b>5</b>	reasons a complete historical accounting cannot be rendered, and	02:56:45 <b>5</b>	D.C., and then three more on the next page where you were
6	we'll be looking at some of the specific audits, some of which	6	involved in turnaround planning and experience.
7	were ordered by him while he was special trustee. We'll review	7	A. That is correct.
8	the advice from a financial institutional advisor to the	8	<b>Q.</b> And then toward the bottom it indicates your work as a bank
9	Department of Interior regarding what they would do in	9	regulator, experience with the Comptroller of the Currency, and
02:52:50 10	situations where there are missing records.	02:57:03 10	you were there this is one particular position that you had,
11	The third area will be we will address the issue of cost	11	and if we look at the next page, you were with the Comptroller
12	and appropriations and the government's sacrificing accuracy and	12	of the Currency from 1966 to 1982, and that's summarized there
13	completeness as a result of them. Fourth, dealing with some key	13	at the top of the page, correct?
14	definitional issues as to what the accounting statement or	14	A. That is correct. That was my principal experience with the
02:53:14 15	accounting should include, and who is to be covered. And	02:57:28 15	government. I spent the last five years there as the senior
16	finally, the application of certain fundamental trust principles	16	career bank official for the office of the Comptroller of the
17	to this matter.	17	Currency, which supervises the national banks and the largest
18	PAUL HOMAN, WITNESS FOR THE PLAINTIFFS, SWORN	18	trust companies in the country.
19	DIRECT EXAMINATION	19	Q. And then it shows your work as a special trustee, and then
02:53:30 20	BY MR. DORRIS:	02:57:46 20	at the bottom of this page it shows your educational experience;
21	Q. Mr. Homan, have you provided an expert report that sets out	21	is that correct?
22	your qualifications and your background?	22	A. Yes.
23	A. Yes, I have. It's attached as one of the appendices in my	23	MR. DORRIS: Your Honor, I would tender Mr. Homan as
24	expert report, not only this time but in 2003, and it's also	24	an expert in trust management and trust standards and trust and
		0.5	
02:54:05 <b>25</b>	briefed in a paragraph in the beginning of my expert report.	02:58:00 <b>25</b>	regulatory accounting.
		02:58:00 <b>25</b>	regulatory accounting.  Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR  Official Court Reporter

	1520		1522
1	MR. QUINN: Your Honor, we have no objection to this	1	not qualified to opine on accounting matters. It's not been
2	witness as an expert in general matters of trust administration.	2	established he's an expert in the field of accounting. He's
3	I don't believe the witness has any training or certification	3	testifying to application of standards, generally accepted
4	here in the accounting, and we would object to his certification	4	accounting principles and generally accepted auditing standards.
02:58:20 <b>5</b>	or being received as an expert on accounting matters, trust or	03:01:43 5	He's not qualified to opine in that regard.
02:58:20 6	otherwise.	03:01:43	THE COURT: Well, he's got a lot of experience,
7		7	counsel, a lot of experience in a lot of related areas. I'm
8	THE COURT: Well, let's hear what his opinions are, and if you want to object to his opinions as he renders them on	8	going to overrule the objection. You can make what you want of
9	the grounds that they're not qualified, I'll either consider	9	it on cross-examination.
02:58:32 10		03:01:53 10	
11	your objections or let you do <i>voir dire</i> . But let's proceed.	11	Proceed, Mr. Dorris.
12	MR. QUINN: Thank you, Your Honor.	12	MR. DORRIS: Thank you, Your Honor. BY MR. DORRIS:
13	MR. DORRIS: Thank you, Your Honor.  BY MR. DORRIS:	13	
14	Q. Let's look at Plaintiffs' Exhibit 4210, your expert report	14	Q. Mr. Homan, let me try to break some of that down that you just talked about, first of all. First of all, while I think
02:58:44 15	again, on page 4. And if you will Your Honor, I would just	03:02:06 15	the Court is very familiar with it, you referred to GAAP, which
16	say, starting here at paragraph Roman numeral V, if you would	16	
17	blow that up you will see his separate opinions are separated	17	is G-A-A-P, general?  A. Accepted accounting principles. And GAAS, which is
18		18	
19	with the capital letters A, and then it goes on through E, five separate ones, which correlate to the five areas that I	19	generally accepted auditing standards.  Q. And that's GASS?
02:59:10 20	indicated to you at the outset I would be covering. And I think	03:02:19 20	A. GAAS.
21	we can get started substantially on item A.	03.02.19 20	Q. And those are standards that you have worked with for many
22	Mr. Homan, this is then in your report where you've tried	22	years?
23	to set out your specific opinions; is that correct?	23	A. Yes. And they're also consistent with regulatory
24	A. Yes.	24	accounting principles, which have been used since the '30s by
02:59:25 <b>25</b>	Q. The first one, as the Court has an opportunity to look at	03:02:37 <b>25</b>	the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency and the other
02.00.20	Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR	00.02.07	Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
	Official Court Reporter		Official Court Reporter
	<u> </u>		
	1521		1523
1	it. can you state and summarize what you were conveying there?	1	1523 federal banking agencies. They're generally more conservative
1 2	it, can you state and summarize what you were conveying there?	1 2	federal banking agencies. They're generally more conservative
1 2 3	it, can you state and summarize what you were conveying there?  A. Yes. The standards of the Department of Interior in my	1 2 3	federal banking agencies. They're generally more conservative accounting principles than used in GAAP, although they came
2	it, can you state and summarize what you were conveying there?	2	federal banking agencies. They're generally more conservative
3	it, can you state and summarize what you were conveying there?  A. Yes. The standards of the Department of Interior in my view, and I believe in the solicitor's view, as expressed to me at least when I was in the Office of the Trustee, is that they	3	federal banking agencies. They're generally more conservative accounting principles than used in GAAP, although they came together in the late 1990s 1970s.  Q. So were you a commissioned or certified bank examiner? I
2 3 4	it, can you state and summarize what you were conveying there?  A. Yes. The standards of the Department of Interior in my view, and I believe in the solicitor's view, as expressed to me	2 3 4	federal banking agencies. They're generally more conservative accounting principles than used in GAAP, although they came together in the late 1990s 1970s.
2 3 4 02:59:52 5	it, can you state and summarize what you were conveying there?  A. Yes. The standards of the Department of Interior in my view, and I believe in the solicitor's view, as expressed to me at least when I was in the Office of the Trustee, is that they must meet the standards of an ordinary trustee. I was the bank	2 3 4 03:02:57 <b>5</b>	federal banking agencies. They're generally more conservative accounting principles than used in GAAP, although they came together in the late 1990s 1970s.  Q. So were you a commissioned or certified bank examiner? I can't remember what
2 3 4 02:59:52 5 6	it, can you state and summarize what you were conveying there?  A. Yes. The standards of the Department of Interior in my view, and I believe in the solicitor's view, as expressed to me at least when I was in the Office of the Trustee, is that they must meet the standards of an ordinary trustee. I was the bank supervisor for many years of some of the largest trust companies	2 3 4 03:02:57 <b>5</b>	federal banking agencies. They're generally more conservative accounting principles than used in GAAP, although they came together in the late 1990s 1970s.  Q. So were you a commissioned or certified bank examiner? I can't remember what  A. I was a certified national bank examiner.
2 3 4 02:59:52 5 6 7	it, can you state and summarize what you were conveying there?  A. Yes. The standards of the Department of Interior in my view, and I believe in the solicitor's view, as expressed to me at least when I was in the Office of the Trustee, is that they must meet the standards of an ordinary trustee. I was the bank supervisor for many years of some of the largest trust companies in the world. I'm aware that in connection with all national	2 3 4 03:02:57 5 6 7	federal banking agencies. They're generally more conservative accounting principles than used in GAAP, although they came together in the late 1990s 1970s.  Q. So were you a commissioned or certified bank examiner? I can't remember what  A. I was a certified national bank examiner.  Q. Okay.
2 3 4 02:59:52 5 6 7 8	it, can you state and summarize what you were conveying there?  A. Yes. The standards of the Department of Interior in my view, and I believe in the solicitor's view, as expressed to me at least when I was in the Office of the Trustee, is that they must meet the standards of an ordinary trustee. I was the bank supervisor for many years of some of the largest trust companies in the world. I'm aware that in connection with all national bank trust companies, they have been required since the late	2 3 4 03:02:57 5 6 7 8	federal banking agencies. They're generally more conservative accounting principles than used in GAAP, although they came together in the late 1990s 1970s.  Q. So were you a commissioned or certified bank examiner? I can't remember what  A. I was a certified national bank examiner.  Q. Okay.  A. Which is the functional equivalent of a CPA, with the
2 3 4 02:59:52 5 6 7 8 9	it, can you state and summarize what you were conveying there?  A. Yes. The standards of the Department of Interior in my view, and I believe in the solicitor's view, as expressed to me at least when I was in the Office of the Trustee, is that they must meet the standards of an ordinary trustee. I was the bank supervisor for many years of some of the largest trust companies in the world. I'm aware that in connection with all national bank trust companies, they have been required since the late '70s, along with public trust companies, to keep their books in	2 3 4 03:02:57 5 6 7 8 9	federal banking agencies. They're generally more conservative accounting principles than used in GAAP, although they came together in the late 1990s 1970s.  Q. So were you a commissioned or certified bank examiner? I can't remember what  A. I was a certified national bank examiner.  Q. Okay.  A. Which is the functional equivalent of a CPA, with the additional distinction that bank examiners look not only by law
2 3 4 02:59:52 5 6 7 8 9 03:00:14 10	it, can you state and summarize what you were conveying there?  A. Yes. The standards of the Department of Interior in my view, and I believe in the solicitor's view, as expressed to me at least when I was in the Office of the Trustee, is that they must meet the standards of an ordinary trustee. I was the bank supervisor for many years of some of the largest trust companies in the world. I'm aware that in connection with all national bank trust companies, they have been required since the late '70s, along with public trust companies, to keep their books in accordance with GAAP, and to have an independent outside audit	2 3 4 03:02:57 5 6 7 8 9 03:03:10 10	federal banking agencies. They're generally more conservative accounting principles than used in GAAP, although they came together in the late 1990s 1970s.  Q. So were you a commissioned or certified bank examiner? I can't remember what  A. I was a certified national bank examiner.  Q. Okay.  A. Which is the functional equivalent of a CPA, with the additional distinction that bank examiners look not only by law at history, which is what the accountants look at, but also rate
2 3 4 02:59:52 5 6 7 8 9 03:00:14 10 11	it, can you state and summarize what you were conveying there?  A. Yes. The standards of the Department of Interior in my view, and I believe in the solicitor's view, as expressed to me at least when I was in the Office of the Trustee, is that they must meet the standards of an ordinary trustee. I was the bank supervisor for many years of some of the largest trust companies in the world. I'm aware that in connection with all national bank trust companies, they have been required since the late '70s, along with public trust companies, to keep their books in accordance with GAAP, and to have an independent outside audit conducted annually, using the generally accepted auditing	2 3 4 03:02:57 5 6 7 8 9 03:03:10 10	federal banking agencies. They're generally more conservative accounting principles than used in GAAP, although they came together in the late 1990s 1970s.  Q. So were you a commissioned or certified bank examiner? I can't remember what  A. I was a certified national bank examiner.  Q. Okay.  A. Which is the functional equivalent of a CPA, with the additional distinction that bank examiners look not only by law at history, which is what the accountants look at, but also rate banks as to the competence and integrity of management and their
2 3 4 02:59:52 5 6 7 8 9 03:00:14 10 11	it, can you state and summarize what you were conveying there?  A. Yes. The standards of the Department of Interior in my view, and I believe in the solicitor's view, as expressed to me at least when I was in the Office of the Trustee, is that they must meet the standards of an ordinary trustee. I was the bank supervisor for many years of some of the largest trust companies in the world. I'm aware that in connection with all national bank trust companies, they have been required since the late '70s, along with public trust companies, to keep their books in accordance with GAAP, and to have an independent outside audit conducted annually, using the generally accepted auditing standards.	2 3 4 03:02:57 5 6 7 8 9 03:03:10 10 11	federal banking agencies. They're generally more conservative accounting principles than used in GAAP, although they came together in the late 1990s 1970s.  Q. So were you a commissioned or certified bank examiner? I can't remember what  A. I was a certified national bank examiner.  Q. Okay.  A. Which is the functional equivalent of a CPA, with the additional distinction that bank examiners look not only by law at history, which is what the accountants look at, but also rate banks as to the competence and integrity of management and their future prospects which, according to several financial criteria
2 3 4 02:59:52 5 6 7 8 9 03:00:14 10 11 12 13	it, can you state and summarize what you were conveying there?  A. Yes. The standards of the Department of Interior in my view, and I believe in the solicitor's view, as expressed to me at least when I was in the Office of the Trustee, is that they must meet the standards of an ordinary trustee. I was the bank supervisor for many years of some of the largest trust companies in the world. I'm aware that in connection with all national bank trust companies, they have been required since the late '70s, along with public trust companies, to keep their books in accordance with GAAP, and to have an independent outside audit conducted annually, using the generally accepted auditing standards.  The Department of the Interior has neither. Therefore, I	2 3 4 03:02:57 5 6 7 8 9 03:03:10 10 11 12 13	federal banking agencies. They're generally more conservative accounting principles than used in GAAP, although they came together in the late 1990s 1970s.  Q. So were you a commissioned or certified bank examiner? I can't remember what  A. I was a certified national bank examiner.  Q. Okay.  A. Which is the functional equivalent of a CPA, with the additional distinction that bank examiners look not only by law at history, which is what the accountants look at, but also rate banks as to the competence and integrity of management and their future prospects which, according to several financial criteria in common use by the rating agencies in the private sector, and
2 3 4 02:59:52 5 6 7 8 9 03:00:14 10 11 12 13	it, can you state and summarize what you were conveying there?  A. Yes. The standards of the Department of Interior in my view, and I believe in the solicitor's view, as expressed to me at least when I was in the Office of the Trustee, is that they must meet the standards of an ordinary trustee. I was the bank supervisor for many years of some of the largest trust companies in the world. I'm aware that in connection with all national bank trust companies, they have been required since the late '70s, along with public trust companies, to keep their books in accordance with GAAP, and to have an independent outside audit conducted annually, using the generally accepted auditing standards.  The Department of the Interior has neither. Therefore, I believe that no beginning balance can be certified in any of the	2 3 4 03:02:57 5 6 7 8 9 03:03:10 10 11 12 13	federal banking agencies. They're generally more conservative accounting principles than used in GAAP, although they came together in the late 1990s 1970s.  Q. So were you a commissioned or certified bank examiner? I can't remember what  A. I was a certified national bank examiner.  Q. Okay.  A. Which is the functional equivalent of a CPA, with the additional distinction that bank examiners look not only by law at history, which is what the accountants look at, but also rate banks as to the competence and integrity of management and their future prospects which, according to several financial criteria in common use by the rating agencies in the private sector, and in common use by the bank regulators since 1937.
2 3 4 02:59:52 5 6 7 8 9 03:00:14 10 11 12 13 14 03:00:38 15	it, can you state and summarize what you were conveying there?  A. Yes. The standards of the Department of Interior in my view, and I believe in the solicitor's view, as expressed to me at least when I was in the Office of the Trustee, is that they must meet the standards of an ordinary trustee. I was the bank supervisor for many years of some of the largest trust companies in the world. I'm aware that in connection with all national bank trust companies, they have been required since the late '70s, along with public trust companies, to keep their books in accordance with GAAP, and to have an independent outside audit conducted annually, using the generally accepted auditing standards.  The Department of the Interior has neither. Therefore, I believe that no beginning balance can be certified in any of the accounts. I have reviewed extensively the auditing requirements	2 3 4 03:02:57 5 6 7 8 9 03:03:10 10 11 12 13 14 03:03:36 15	federal banking agencies. They're generally more conservative accounting principles than used in GAAP, although they came together in the late 1990s 1970s.  Q. So were you a commissioned or certified bank examiner? I can't remember what  A. I was a certified national bank examiner.  Q. Okay.  A. Which is the functional equivalent of a CPA, with the additional distinction that bank examiners look not only by law at history, which is what the accountants look at, but also rate banks as to the competence and integrity of management and their future prospects which, according to several financial criteria in common use by the rating agencies in the private sector, and in common use by the bank regulators since 1937.  Q. Okay. Let me just, in the first paragraph we have in the
2 3 4 02:59:52 5 6 7 8 9 03:00:14 10 11 12 13 14 03:00:38 15 16	it, can you state and summarize what you were conveying there?  A. Yes. The standards of the Department of Interior in my view, and I believe in the solicitor's view, as expressed to me at least when I was in the Office of the Trustee, is that they must meet the standards of an ordinary trustee. I was the bank supervisor for many years of some of the largest trust companies in the world. I'm aware that in connection with all national bank trust companies, they have been required since the late '70s, along with public trust companies, to keep their books in accordance with GAAP, and to have an independent outside audit conducted annually, using the generally accepted auditing standards.  The Department of the Interior has neither. Therefore, I believe that no beginning balance can be certified in any of the accounts. I have reviewed extensively the auditing requirements set forth by the only four audits ever done by the Bureau of	2 3 4 03:02:57 5 6 7 8 9 03:03:10 10 11 12 13 14 03:03:36 15 16	federal banking agencies. They're generally more conservative accounting principles than used in GAAP, although they came together in the late 1990s 1970s.  Q. So were you a commissioned or certified bank examiner? I can't remember what  A. I was a certified national bank examiner.  Q. Okay.  A. Which is the functional equivalent of a CPA, with the additional distinction that bank examiners look not only by law at history, which is what the accountants look at, but also rate banks as to the competence and integrity of management and their future prospects which, according to several financial criteria in common use by the rating agencies in the private sector, and in common use by the bank regulators since 1937.  Q. Okay. Let me just, in the first paragraph we have in the screen, under item A, it says, "It was my opinion when I served
2 3 4 02:59:52 5 6 7 8 9 03:00:14 10 11 12 13 14 03:00:38 15 16 17 18 19	it, can you state and summarize what you were conveying there?  A. Yes. The standards of the Department of Interior in my view, and I believe in the solicitor's view, as expressed to me at least when I was in the Office of the Trustee, is that they must meet the standards of an ordinary trustee. I was the bank supervisor for many years of some of the largest trust companies in the world. I'm aware that in connection with all national bank trust companies, they have been required since the late '70s, along with public trust companies, to keep their books in accordance with GAAP, and to have an independent outside audit conducted annually, using the generally accepted auditing standards.  The Department of the Interior has neither. Therefore, I believe that no beginning balance can be certified in any of the accounts. I have reviewed extensively the auditing requirements set forth by the only four audits ever done by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and later audits, but those were done by Arthur	2 3 4 03:02:57 5 6 7 8 9 03:03:10 10 11 12 13 14 03:03:36 15 16 17	federal banking agencies. They're generally more conservative accounting principles than used in GAAP, although they came together in the late 1990s 1970s.  Q. So were you a commissioned or certified bank examiner? I can't remember what  A. I was a certified national bank examiner.  Q. Okay.  A. Which is the functional equivalent of a CPA, with the additional distinction that bank examiners look not only by law at history, which is what the accountants look at, but also rate banks as to the competence and integrity of management and their future prospects which, according to several financial criteria in common use by the rating agencies in the private sector, and in common use by the bank regulators since 1937.  Q. Okay. Let me just, in the first paragraph we have in the screen, under item A, it says, "It was my opinion when I served as Special Trustee for American Indians and it continues to be
2 3 4 02:59:52 5 6 7 8 9 03:00:14 10 11 12 13 14 03:00:38 15 16 17 18	it, can you state and summarize what you were conveying there?  A. Yes. The standards of the Department of Interior in my view, and I believe in the solicitor's view, as expressed to me at least when I was in the Office of the Trustee, is that they must meet the standards of an ordinary trustee. I was the bank supervisor for many years of some of the largest trust companies in the world. I'm aware that in connection with all national bank trust companies, they have been required since the late '70s, along with public trust companies, to keep their books in accordance with GAAP, and to have an independent outside audit conducted annually, using the generally accepted auditing standards.  The Department of the Interior has neither. Therefore, I believe that no beginning balance can be certified in any of the accounts. I have reviewed extensively the auditing requirements set forth by the only four audits ever done by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and later audits, but those were done by Arthur Andersen in 1998.	2 3 4 03:02:57 5 6 7 8 9 03:03:10 10 11 12 13 14 03:03:36 15 16 17 18	federal banking agencies. They're generally more conservative accounting principles than used in GAAP, although they came together in the late 1990s 1970s.  Q. So were you a commissioned or certified bank examiner? I can't remember what  A. I was a certified national bank examiner.  Q. Okay.  A. Which is the functional equivalent of a CPA, with the additional distinction that bank examiners look not only by law at history, which is what the accountants look at, but also rate banks as to the competence and integrity of management and their future prospects which, according to several financial criteria in common use by the rating agencies in the private sector, and in common use by the bank regulators since 1937.  Q. Okay. Let me just, in the first paragraph we have in the screen, under item A, it says, "It was my opinion when I served as Special Trustee for American Indians and it continues to be my opinion today that an accurate and complete historical
2 3 4 02:59:52 5 6 7 8 9 03:00:14 10 11 12 13 14 03:00:38 15 16 17 18 19 03:01:00 20 21	it, can you state and summarize what you were conveying there?  A. Yes. The standards of the Department of Interior in my view, and I believe in the solicitor's view, as expressed to me at least when I was in the Office of the Trustee, is that they must meet the standards of an ordinary trustee. I was the bank supervisor for many years of some of the largest trust companies in the world. I'm aware that in connection with all national bank trust companies, they have been required since the late '70s, along with public trust companies, to keep their books in accordance with GAAP, and to have an independent outside audit conducted annually, using the generally accepted auditing standards.  The Department of the Interior has neither. Therefore, I believe that no beginning balance can be certified in any of the accounts. I have reviewed extensively the auditing requirements set forth by the only four audits ever done by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and later audits, but those were done by Arthur Andersen in 1998.  They were all qualified, for the same reasons that the	2 3 4 03:02:57 5 6 7 8 9 03:03:10 10 11 12 13 14 03:03:36 15 16 17 18 19	federal banking agencies. They're generally more conservative accounting principles than used in GAAP, although they came together in the late 1990s 1970s.  Q. So were you a commissioned or certified bank examiner? I can't remember what  A. I was a certified national bank examiner.  Q. Okay.  A. Which is the functional equivalent of a CPA, with the additional distinction that bank examiners look not only by law at history, which is what the accountants look at, but also rate banks as to the competence and integrity of management and their future prospects which, according to several financial criteria in common use by the rating agencies in the private sector, and in common use by the bank regulators since 1937.  Q. Okay. Let me just, in the first paragraph we have in the screen, under item A, it says, "It was my opinion when I served as Special Trustee for American Indians and it continues to be my opinion today that an accurate and complete historical accounting verified with documentation in conformity with
2 3 4 02:59:52 5 6 7 8 9 03:00:14 10 11 12 13 14 03:00:38 15 16 17 18 19 03:01:00 20 21 22	it, can you state and summarize what you were conveying there?  A. Yes. The standards of the Department of Interior in my view, and I believe in the solicitor's view, as expressed to me at least when I was in the Office of the Trustee, is that they must meet the standards of an ordinary trustee. I was the bank supervisor for many years of some of the largest trust companies in the world. I'm aware that in connection with all national bank trust companies, they have been required since the late '70s, along with public trust companies, to keep their books in accordance with GAAP, and to have an independent outside audit conducted annually, using the generally accepted auditing standards.  The Department of the Interior has neither. Therefore, I believe that no beginning balance can be certified in any of the accounts. I have reviewed extensively the auditing requirements set forth by the only four audits ever done by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and later audits, but those were done by Arthur Andersen in 1998.  They were all qualified, for the same reasons that the current reports are qualified, and that is that a GAAP audit	2 3 4 03:02:57 5 6 7 8 9 03:03:10 10 11 12 13 14 03:03:36 15 16 17 18 19 03:03:58 20	federal banking agencies. They're generally more conservative accounting principles than used in GAAP, although they came together in the late 1990s 1970s.  Q. So were you a commissioned or certified bank examiner? I can't remember what  A. I was a certified national bank examiner.  Q. Okay.  A. Which is the functional equivalent of a CPA, with the additional distinction that bank examiners look not only by law at history, which is what the accountants look at, but also rate banks as to the competence and integrity of management and their future prospects which, according to several financial criteria in common use by the rating agencies in the private sector, and in common use by the bank regulators since 1937.  Q. Okay. Let me just, in the first paragraph we have in the screen, under item A, it says, "It was my opinion when I served as Special Trustee for American Indians and it continues to be my opinion today that an accurate and complete historical accounting verified with documentation in conformity with standards set forth in GAAS and GAAP or any other reasonable
2 3 4 02:59:52 5 6 7 8 9 03:00:14 10 11 12 13 14 03:00:38 15 16 17 18 19 03:01:00 20 21 22 23	it, can you state and summarize what you were conveying there?  A. Yes. The standards of the Department of Interior in my view, and I believe in the solicitor's view, as expressed to me at least when I was in the Office of the Trustee, is that they must meet the standards of an ordinary trustee. I was the bank supervisor for many years of some of the largest trust companies in the world. I'm aware that in connection with all national bank trust companies, they have been required since the late '70s, along with public trust companies, to keep their books in accordance with GAAP, and to have an independent outside audit conducted annually, using the generally accepted auditing standards.  The Department of the Interior has neither. Therefore, I believe that no beginning balance can be certified in any of the accounts. I have reviewed extensively the auditing requirements set forth by the only four audits ever done by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and later audits, but those were done by Arthur Andersen in 1998.  They were all qualified, for the same reasons that the current reports are qualified, and that is that a GAAP audit could not be done because of missing records, lack of prior	2 3 4 03:02:57 5 6 7 8 9 03:03:10 10 11 12 13 14 03:03:36 15 16 17 18 19 03:03:58 20 21 22 23	federal banking agencies. They're generally more conservative accounting principles than used in GAAP, although they came together in the late 1990s 1970s.  Q. So were you a commissioned or certified bank examiner? I can't remember what  A. I was a certified national bank examiner.  Q. Okay.  A. Which is the functional equivalent of a CPA, with the additional distinction that bank examiners look not only by law at history, which is what the accountants look at, but also rate banks as to the competence and integrity of management and their future prospects which, according to several financial criteria in common use by the rating agencies in the private sector, and in common use by the bank regulators since 1937.  Q. Okay. Let me just, in the first paragraph we have in the screen, under item A, it says, "It was my opinion when I served as Special Trustee for American Indians and it continues to be my opinion today that an accurate and complete historical accounting verified with documentation in conformity with standards set forth in GAAS and GAAP or any other reasonable standard, cannot be rendered." Do you see that?
2 3 4 02:59:52 5 6 7 8 9 03:00:14 10 11 12 13 14 03:00:38 15 16 17 18 19 03:01:00 20 21 22 23 24	it, can you state and summarize what you were conveying there?  A. Yes. The standards of the Department of Interior in my view, and I believe in the solicitor's view, as expressed to me at least when I was in the Office of the Trustee, is that they must meet the standards of an ordinary trustee. I was the bank supervisor for many years of some of the largest trust companies in the world. I'm aware that in connection with all national bank trust companies, they have been required since the late '70s, along with public trust companies, to keep their books in accordance with GAAP, and to have an independent outside audit conducted annually, using the generally accepted auditing standards.  The Department of the Interior has neither. Therefore, I believe that no beginning balance can be certified in any of the accounts. I have reviewed extensively the auditing requirements set forth by the only four audits ever done by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and later audits, but those were done by Arthur Andersen in 1998.  They were all qualified, for the same reasons that the current reports are qualified, and that is that a GAAP audit could not be done because of missing records, lack of prior audits, and accounting and trust accounting and trust	2 3 4 03:02:57 5 6 7 8 9 03:03:10 10 11 12 13 14 03:03:36 15 16 17 18 19 03:03:58 20 21 22 23 24	federal banking agencies. They're generally more conservative accounting principles than used in GAAP, although they came together in the late 1990s 1970s.  Q. So were you a commissioned or certified bank examiner? I can't remember what  A. I was a certified national bank examiner.  Q. Okay.  A. Which is the functional equivalent of a CPA, with the additional distinction that bank examiners look not only by law at history, which is what the accountants look at, but also rate banks as to the competence and integrity of management and their future prospects which, according to several financial criteria in common use by the rating agencies in the private sector, and in common use by the bank regulators since 1937.  Q. Okay. Let me just, in the first paragraph we have in the screen, under item A, it says, "It was my opinion when I served as Special Trustee for American Indians and it continues to be my opinion today that an accurate and complete historical accounting verified with documentation in conformity with standards set forth in GAAS and GAAP or any other reasonable standard, cannot be rendered." Do you see that?  A. That's correct.
2 3 4 02:59:52 5 6 7 8 9 03:00:14 10 11 12 13 14 03:00:38 15 16 17 18 19 03:01:00 20 21 22 23	it, can you state and summarize what you were conveying there?  A. Yes. The standards of the Department of Interior in my view, and I believe in the solicitor's view, as expressed to me at least when I was in the Office of the Trustee, is that they must meet the standards of an ordinary trustee. I was the bank supervisor for many years of some of the largest trust companies in the world. I'm aware that in connection with all national bank trust companies, they have been required since the late '70s, along with public trust companies, to keep their books in accordance with GAAP, and to have an independent outside audit conducted annually, using the generally accepted auditing standards.  The Department of the Interior has neither. Therefore, I believe that no beginning balance can be certified in any of the accounts. I have reviewed extensively the auditing requirements set forth by the only four audits ever done by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and later audits, but those were done by Arthur Andersen in 1998.  They were all qualified, for the same reasons that the current reports are qualified, and that is that a GAAP audit could not be done because of missing records, lack of prior audits, and accounting and trust accounting and trust management systems that were unreliable for decades.	2 3 4 03:02:57 5 6 7 8 9 03:03:10 10 11 12 13 14 03:03:36 15 16 17 18 19 03:03:58 20 21 22 23	federal banking agencies. They're generally more conservative accounting principles than used in GAAP, although they came together in the late 1990s 1970s.  Q. So were you a commissioned or certified bank examiner? I can't remember what  A. I was a certified national bank examiner.  Q. Okay.  A. Which is the functional equivalent of a CPA, with the additional distinction that bank examiners look not only by law at history, which is what the accountants look at, but also rate banks as to the competence and integrity of management and their future prospects which, according to several financial criteria in common use by the rating agencies in the private sector, and in common use by the bank regulators since 1937.  Q. Okay. Let me just, in the first paragraph we have in the screen, under item A, it says, "It was my opinion when I served as Special Trustee for American Indians and it continues to be my opinion today that an accurate and complete historical accounting verified with documentation in conformity with standards set forth in GAAS and GAAP or any other reasonable standard, cannot be rendered." Do you see that?  A. That's correct.  Q. And you indicated in addition to GAAS and GAAP, you put in
2 3 4 02:59:52 5 6 7 8 9 03:00:14 10 11 12 13 14 03:00:38 15 16 17 18 19 03:01:00 20 21 22 23 24	it, can you state and summarize what you were conveying there?  A. Yes. The standards of the Department of Interior in my view, and I believe in the solicitor's view, as expressed to me at least when I was in the Office of the Trustee, is that they must meet the standards of an ordinary trustee. I was the bank supervisor for many years of some of the largest trust companies in the world. I'm aware that in connection with all national bank trust companies, they have been required since the late '70s, along with public trust companies, to keep their books in accordance with GAAP, and to have an independent outside audit conducted annually, using the generally accepted auditing standards.  The Department of the Interior has neither. Therefore, I believe that no beginning balance can be certified in any of the accounts. I have reviewed extensively the auditing requirements set forth by the only four audits ever done by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and later audits, but those were done by Arthur Andersen in 1998.  They were all qualified, for the same reasons that the current reports are qualified, and that is that a GAAP audit could not be done because of missing records, lack of prior audits, and accounting and trust accounting and trust management systems that were unreliable for decades.  MR. QUINN: Your Honor, I object and move to strike.	2 3 4 03:02:57 5 6 7 8 9 03:03:10 10 11 12 13 14 03:03:36 15 16 17 18 19 03:03:58 20 21 22 23 24	federal banking agencies. They're generally more conservative accounting principles than used in GAAP, although they came together in the late 1990s 1970s.  Q. So were you a commissioned or certified bank examiner? I can't remember what  A. I was a certified national bank examiner.  Q. Okay.  A. Which is the functional equivalent of a CPA, with the additional distinction that bank examiners look not only by law at history, which is what the accountants look at, but also rate banks as to the competence and integrity of management and their future prospects which, according to several financial criteria in common use by the rating agencies in the private sector, and in common use by the bank regulators since 1937.  Q. Okay. Let me just, in the first paragraph we have in the screen, under item A, it says, "It was my opinion when I served as Special Trustee for American Indians and it continues to be my opinion today that an accurate and complete historical accounting verified with documentation in conformity with standards set forth in GAAS and GAAP or any other reasonable standard, cannot be rendered." Do you see that?  A. That's correct.  Q. And you indicated in addition to GAAS and GAAP, you put in there "any other reasonable standard." Why did you say that?

	1524		1526
1		1	
2	are consistent with GAAP that are specifically designed to deal	1	that was done by KPMG?
3	with missing records or unreliable trust accounting systems.	3	A. Yes. I reviewed each one from 1995, the first one, through
4	And they have been used extensively by the public sector in	4	the year 2006, although in some cases the management letters
_	the for example, over 2,000 times by the OCC and FDIC since	_	that accompanied those, setting forth the specific material
03:04:42 5	the bank resolutions or excuse me, the bank failures from the	03:08:09 5	weaknesses, I didn't read. But I did read the one in 2006.
7	1970s forward.	7	Q. And are those the four groups that you were referring to
8	They've been used in every bank merger case that involves a	8	earlier?
9	purchase and assumption transaction and the like. And they're	9	A. No. The fourth one was an audit that I ordered, which was
03:04:57 10	generally described, as I've said just below that, in the	03:08:31 10	essentially a legal documentation check of some 790,000 OTFM
03:04:57	methodology proposed by the Bank of America as to how they would		accounts that was conducted in the late '90s while I was there.
12	handle situations where substantial missing records are missing	11 12	And it involved bringing in all of the OTFM records, which were
13	or where the trust systems, accounting systems, management	13	the trust accounting records, not the Bureau's records, and we
14	systems are unreliable.	14	did a legal doc check on each one of those files.
03:05:20 15	Q. Okay. We'll get to the Bank of America part. You talk	03:08:54 15	Q. And is that what you've referred to in your documentation
16	about that the opinion you've just given is one that was shared	16	as the file check?
17	by each of the independent certified public accounting firms	17	A. That's right.  Q. All right. Let's look
18	that have audited the individual Indian trusts. Give us a brief	18	Q. All right. Let's look A. It wasn't an audit, per se.
19	overview of what audits are available to look at of the BIA or	19	Q. It was not an audit in terms of having a CPA come in and
03:05:45 20	the individual Indian trusts that you're referring to.  A. All right. While I was there and subsequently there has	03:09:09 20	look at financial records; is that right?
21	been four major categories that I would call attempts at a GAAS	21	A. Right.
22	or GAAP audit. The first four were conducted by Arthur Andersen	22	Q. All right. Now, if we might pull up Plaintiffs' Exhibit
23	from 1988 through 1991. Those were the only audits conducted of	23	575. And if you would blow that up. This indicates it's the
24	the entire Bureau of Indian Affairs' accounting and management	24	Arthur Andersen tribal and individual Indian monies trust fund
03:06:15 <b>25</b>	systems, since the Office of Trust Fund Management did not exist	03:09:33 <b>25</b>	audit, financial statements as of September 30, 1989 and 1988.
30.00.10	Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR	00.00.00	Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
	Official Court Reporter		Official Court Reporter
	1525		1527
1		1	
1 2	at that time. They were all qualified, for the reasons I suggested earlier, and essentially for missing records. The	1 2	Is this one of the is this the first of the Arthur Andersen
_	at that time. They were all qualified, for the reasons I	_	
2	at that time. They were all qualified, for the reasons I suggested earlier, and essentially for missing records. The	2	Is this one of the is this the first of the Arthur Andersen audits of BIA that you referred to earlier?
2	at that time. They were all qualified, for the reasons I suggested earlier, and essentially for missing records. The fact that the	2	Is this one of the is this the first of the Arthur Andersen audits of BIA that you referred to earlier?  A. Yes.
2 3 4	at that time. They were all qualified, for the reasons I suggested earlier, and essentially for missing records. The fact that the  Q. I'm just looking for what we'll get into the particular	2 3 4	Is this one of the is this the first of the Arthur Andersen audits of BIA that you referred to earlier?  A. Yes.  Q. All right. Let's look then at the next page well, let's
2 3 4 03:06:37 <b>5</b>	at that time. They were all qualified, for the reasons I suggested earlier, and essentially for missing records. The fact that the  Q. I'm just looking for what we'll get into the particular ones.	2 3 4 03:09:59 5	Is this one of the is this the first of the Arthur Andersen audits of BIA that you referred to earlier?  A. Yes.  Q. All right. Let's look then at the next page well, let's go one more after that. And let's blow up first of all, the
2 3 4 03:06:37 5 6	at that time. They were all qualified, for the reasons I suggested earlier, and essentially for missing records. The fact that the  Q. I'm just looking for what we'll get into the particular ones.  A. All right. For the same reasons.	2 3 4 03:09:59 5 6	Is this one of the is this the first of the Arthur Andersen audits of BIA that you referred to earlier?  A. Yes.  Q. All right. Let's look then at the next page well, let's go one more after that. And let's blow up first of all, the date is May 11, 1990. And you can see that it's for the periods
2 3 4 03:06:37 5 6 7	at that time. They were all qualified, for the reasons I suggested earlier, and essentially for missing records. The fact that the  Q. I'm just looking for what we'll get into the particular ones.  A. All right. For the same reasons.  Q. You first got Arthur Andersen audits of BIA for four years	2 3 4 03:09:59 5 6 7	Is this one of the is this the first of the Arthur Andersen audits of BIA that you referred to earlier?  A. Yes.  Q. All right. Let's look then at the next page well, let's go one more after that. And let's blow up first of all, the date is May 11, 1990. And you can see that it's for the periods that it said on the cover, and let's look down at the bottom two
2 3 4 03:06:37 5 6 7 8	at that time. They were all qualified, for the reasons I suggested earlier, and essentially for missing records. The fact that the  Q. I'm just looking for what we'll get into the particular ones.  A. All right. For the same reasons.  Q. You first got Arthur Andersen audits of BIA for four years in the late 1980s.	2 3 4 03:09:59 5 6 7 8	Is this one of the is this the first of the Arthur Andersen audits of BIA that you referred to earlier?  A. Yes.  Q. All right. Let's look then at the next page well, let's go one more after that. And let's blow up first of all, the date is May 11, 1990. And you can see that it's for the periods that it said on the cover, and let's look down at the bottom two paragraphs of this first page.
2 3 4 03:06:37 5 6 7 8 9	at that time. They were all qualified, for the reasons I suggested earlier, and essentially for missing records. The fact that the Q. I'm just looking for what we'll get into the particular ones. A. All right. For the same reasons. Q. You first got Arthur Andersen audits of BIA for four years in the late 1980s. A. That's correct. All right. The next one then was the	2 3 4 03:09:59 5 6 7 8 9	Is this one of the is this the first of the Arthur Andersen audits of BIA that you referred to earlier?  A. Yes.  Q. All right. Let's look then at the next page well, let's go one more after that. And let's blow up first of all, the date is May 11, 1990. And you can see that it's for the periods that it said on the cover, and let's look down at the bottom two paragraphs of this first page.  And in the next to last paragraph on this page, it talks
2 3 4 03:06:37 5 6 7 8 9 03:06:49 10 11	at that time. They were all qualified, for the reasons I suggested earlier, and essentially for missing records. The fact that the  Q. I'm just looking for what we'll get into the particular ones.  A. All right. For the same reasons.  Q. You first got Arthur Andersen audits of BIA for four years in the late 1980s.  A. That's correct. All right. The next one then was the tribal reconciliation project, also conducted by Arthur	2 3 4 03:09:59 5 6 7 8 9 03:10:24 10 11	Is this one of the is this the first of the Arthur Andersen audits of BIA that you referred to earlier?  A. Yes.  Q. All right. Let's look then at the next page well, let's go one more after that. And let's blow up first of all, the date is May 11, 1990. And you can see that it's for the periods that it said on the cover, and let's look down at the bottom two paragraphs of this first page.  And in the next to last paragraph on this page, it talks about "The 1988 audit was the first known financial statement
2 3 4 03:06:37 5 6 7 8 9 03:06:49 10 11 12 13	at that time. They were all qualified, for the reasons I suggested earlier, and essentially for missing records. The fact that the  Q. I'm just looking for what we'll get into the particular ones.  A. All right. For the same reasons.  Q. You first got Arthur Andersen audits of BIA for four years in the late 1980s.  A. That's correct. All right. The next one then was the tribal reconciliation project, also conducted by Arthur Andersen, which attempted to do a GAAP/GAAS audit of the	2 3 4 03:09:59 5 6 7 8 9 03:10:24 10 11 12 13	Is this one of the is this the first of the Arthur Andersen audits of BIA that you referred to earlier?  A. Yes.  Q. All right. Let's look then at the next page well, let's go one more after that. And let's blow up first of all, the date is May 11, 1990. And you can see that it's for the periods that it said on the cover, and let's look down at the bottom two paragraphs of this first page.  And in the next to last paragraph on this page, it talks about "The 1988 audit was the first known financial statement audit by independent public accountants of the tribal and
2 3 4 03:06:37 5 6 7 8 9 03:06:49 10 11 12 13	at that time. They were all qualified, for the reasons I suggested earlier, and essentially for missing records. The fact that the  Q. I'm just looking for what we'll get into the particular ones.  A. All right. For the same reasons.  Q. You first got Arthur Andersen audits of BIA for four years in the late 1980s.  A. That's correct. All right. The next one then was the tribal reconciliation project, also conducted by Arthur Andersen, which attempted to do a GAAP/GAAS audit of the transactions for the tribes in the 1971 to 1992 period.	2 3 4 03:09:59 5 6 7 8 9 03:10:24 10 11	Is this one of the is this the first of the Arthur Andersen audits of BIA that you referred to earlier?  A. Yes.  Q. All right. Let's look then at the next page well, let's go one more after that. And let's blow up first of all, the date is May 11, 1990. And you can see that it's for the periods that it said on the cover, and let's look down at the bottom two paragraphs of this first page.  And in the next to last paragraph on this page, it talks about "The 1988 audit was the first known financial statement audit by independent public accountants of the tribal and individual Indian monies trust funds managed by the Bureau, and
2 3 4 03:06:37 5 6 7 8 9 03:06:49 10 11 12 13 14 03:07:13 15	at that time. They were all qualified, for the reasons I suggested earlier, and essentially for missing records. The fact that the  Q. I'm just looking for what we'll get into the particular ones.  A. All right. For the same reasons.  Q. You first got Arthur Andersen audits of BIA for four years in the late 1980s.  A. That's correct. All right. The next one then was the tribal reconciliation project, also conducted by Arthur Andersen, which attempted to do a GAAP/GAAS audit of the transactions for the tribes in the 1971 to 1992 period.  Q. So that's kind of the second item. And you mentioned there	2 3 4 03:09:59 5 6 7 8 9 03:10:24 10 11 12 13 14 03:10:46 15	Is this one of the is this the first of the Arthur Andersen audits of BIA that you referred to earlier?  A. Yes.  Q. All right. Let's look then at the next page well, let's go one more after that. And let's blow up first of all, the date is May 11, 1990. And you can see that it's for the periods that it said on the cover, and let's look down at the bottom two paragraphs of this first page.  And in the next to last paragraph on this page, it talks about "The 1988 audit was the first known financial statement audit by independent public accountants of the tribal and individual Indian monies trust funds managed by the Bureau, and the scope of our engagement was not sufficient with respect to
2 3 4 03:06:37 5 6 7 8 9 03:06:49 10 11 12 13 14 03:07:13 15 16	at that time. They were all qualified, for the reasons I suggested earlier, and essentially for missing records. The fact that the  Q. I'm just looking for what we'll get into the particular ones.  A. All right. For the same reasons.  Q. You first got Arthur Andersen audits of BIA for four years in the late 1980s.  A. That's correct. All right. The next one then was the tribal reconciliation project, also conducted by Arthur Andersen, which attempted to do a GAAP/GAAS audit of the transactions for the tribes in the 1971 to 1992 period.  Q. So that's kind of the second item. And you mentioned there were four?	2 3 4 03:09:59 5 6 7 8 9 03:10:24 10 11 12 13 14 03:10:46 15 16	Is this one of the is this the first of the Arthur Andersen audits of BIA that you referred to earlier?  A. Yes.  Q. All right. Let's look then at the next page well, let's go one more after that. And let's blow up first of all, the date is May 11, 1990. And you can see that it's for the periods that it said on the cover, and let's look down at the bottom two paragraphs of this first page.  And in the next to last paragraph on this page, it talks about "The 1988 audit was the first known financial statement audit by independent public accountants of the tribal and individual Indian monies trust funds managed by the Bureau, and the scope of our engagement was not sufficient with respect to the financial statements for preceding periods, from inception
2 3 4 03:06:37 5 6 7 8 9 03:06:49 10 11 12 13 14 03:07:13 15 16 17	at that time. They were all qualified, for the reasons I suggested earlier, and essentially for missing records. The fact that the  Q. I'm just looking for what we'll get into the particular ones.  A. All right. For the same reasons.  Q. You first got Arthur Andersen audits of BIA for four years in the late 1980s.  A. That's correct. All right. The next one then was the tribal reconciliation project, also conducted by Arthur Andersen, which attempted to do a GAAP/GAAS audit of the transactions for the tribes in the 1971 to 1992 period.  Q. So that's kind of the second item. And you mentioned there were four?  A. I was the receiving official on those. The next one was a	2 3 4 03:09:59 5 6 7 8 9 03:10:24 10 11 12 13 14 03:10:46 15 16 17	Is this one of the is this the first of the Arthur Andersen audits of BIA that you referred to earlier?  A. Yes.  Q. All right. Let's look then at the next page well, let's go one more after that. And let's blow up first of all, the date is May 11, 1990. And you can see that it's for the periods that it said on the cover, and let's look down at the bottom two paragraphs of this first page.  And in the next to last paragraph on this page, it talks about "The 1988 audit was the first known financial statement audit by independent public accountants of the tribal and individual Indian monies trust funds managed by the Bureau, and the scope of our engagement was not sufficient with respect to the financial statements for preceding periods, from inception through September 30, 1987, to enable us to determine the
2 3 4 03:06:37 5 6 7 8 9 03:06:49 10 11 12 13 14 03:07:13 15 16 17	at that time. They were all qualified, for the reasons I suggested earlier, and essentially for missing records. The fact that the  Q. I'm just looking for what we'll get into the particular ones.  A. All right. For the same reasons.  Q. You first got Arthur Andersen audits of BIA for four years in the late 1980s.  A. That's correct. All right. The next one then was the tribal reconciliation project, also conducted by Arthur Andersen, which attempted to do a GAAP/GAAS audit of the transactions for the tribes in the 1971 to 1992 period.  Q. So that's kind of the second item. And you mentioned there were four?  A. I was the receiving official on those. The next one was a selected audit by an independent outside audit that was required by the Reform Act for the Office of Trust Fund Management, and I received the first one, the second one, the	2 3 4 03:09:59 5 6 7 8 9 03:10:24 10 11 12 13 14 03:10:46 15 16 17 18	Is this one of the is this the first of the Arthur Andersen audits of BIA that you referred to earlier?  A. Yes.  Q. All right. Let's look then at the next page well, let's go one more after that. And let's blow up first of all, the date is May 11, 1990. And you can see that it's for the periods that it said on the cover, and let's look down at the bottom two paragraphs of this first page.  And in the next to last paragraph on this page, it talks about "The 1988 audit was the first known financial statement audit by independent public accountants of the tribal and individual Indian monies trust funds managed by the Bureau, and the scope of our engagement was not sufficient with respect to the financial statements for preceding periods, from inception through September 30, 1987, to enable us to determine the propriety of trust fund balances resulting from prior activity, and what portions of adjustments identified in our 1988 audit related to prior periods." Do you see that?
2 3 4 03:06:37 5 6 7 8 9 03:06:49 10 11 12 13 14 03:07:13 15 16 17 18 19	at that time. They were all qualified, for the reasons I suggested earlier, and essentially for missing records. The fact that the  Q. I'm just looking for what we'll get into the particular ones.  A. All right. For the same reasons.  Q. You first got Arthur Andersen audits of BIA for four years in the late 1980s.  A. That's correct. All right. The next one then was the tribal reconciliation project, also conducted by Arthur Andersen, which attempted to do a GAAP/GAAS audit of the transactions for the tribes in the 1971 to 1992 period.  Q. So that's kind of the second item. And you mentioned there were four?  A. I was the receiving official on those. The next one was a selected audit by an independent outside audit that was required by the Reform Act for the Office of Trust Fund Management, and I received the first one, the second one, the third one, and there has been one every year since.	2 3 4 03:09:59 5 6 7 8 9 03:10:24 10 11 12 13 14 03:10:46 15 16 17 18 19	Is this one of the is this the first of the Arthur Andersen audits of BIA that you referred to earlier?  A. Yes.  Q. All right. Let's look then at the next page well, let's go one more after that. And let's blow up first of all, the date is May 11, 1990. And you can see that it's for the periods that it said on the cover, and let's look down at the bottom two paragraphs of this first page.  And in the next to last paragraph on this page, it talks about "The 1988 audit was the first known financial statement audit by independent public accountants of the tribal and individual Indian monies trust funds managed by the Bureau, and the scope of our engagement was not sufficient with respect to the financial statements for preceding periods, from inception through September 30, 1987, to enable us to determine the propriety of trust fund balances resulting from prior activity, and what portions of adjustments identified in our 1988 audit related to prior periods." Do you see that?  A. Yes.
2 3 4 03:06:37 5 6 7 8 9 03:06:49 10 11 12 13 14 03:07:13 15 16 17 18 19 03:07:36 20	at that time. They were all qualified, for the reasons I suggested earlier, and essentially for missing records. The fact that the  Q. I'm just looking for what we'll get into the particular ones.  A. All right. For the same reasons.  Q. You first got Arthur Andersen audits of BIA for four years in the late 1980s.  A. That's correct. All right. The next one then was the tribal reconciliation project, also conducted by Arthur Andersen, which attempted to do a GAAP/GAAS audit of the transactions for the tribes in the 1971 to 1992 period.  Q. So that's kind of the second item. And you mentioned there were four?  A. I was the receiving official on those. The next one was a selected audit by an independent outside audit that was required by the Reform Act for the Office of Trust Fund Management, and I received the first one, the second one, the third one, and there has been one every year since.  Q. And the first initial ones were done by Griffin as the	2 3 4 03:09:59 5 6 7 8 9 03:10:24 10 11 12 13 14 03:10:46 15 16 17 18 19 03:11:03 20	Is this one of the is this the first of the Arthur Andersen audits of BIA that you referred to earlier?  A. Yes.  Q. All right. Let's look then at the next page well, let's go one more after that. And let's blow up first of all, the date is May 11, 1990. And you can see that it's for the periods that it said on the cover, and let's look down at the bottom two paragraphs of this first page.  And in the next to last paragraph on this page, it talks about "The 1988 audit was the first known financial statement audit by independent public accountants of the tribal and individual Indian monies trust funds managed by the Bureau, and the scope of our engagement was not sufficient with respect to the financial statements for preceding periods, from inception through September 30, 1987, to enable us to determine the propriety of trust fund balances resulting from prior activity, and what portions of adjustments identified in our 1988 audit related to prior periods." Do you see that?  A. Yes.  Q. Now, was this an audit that you reviewed while it was
2 3 4 03:06:37 5 6 7 8 9 03:06:49 10 11 12 13 14 03:07:13 15 16 17 18 19 03:07:36 20 21	at that time. They were all qualified, for the reasons I suggested earlier, and essentially for missing records. The fact that the  Q. I'm just looking for what we'll get into the particular ones.  A. All right. For the same reasons.  Q. You first got Arthur Andersen audits of BIA for four years in the late 1980s.  A. That's correct. All right. The next one then was the tribal reconciliation project, also conducted by Arthur Andersen, which attempted to do a GAAP/GAAS audit of the transactions for the tribes in the 1971 to 1992 period.  Q. So that's kind of the second item. And you mentioned there were four?  A. I was the receiving official on those. The next one was a selected audit by an independent outside audit that was required by the Reform Act for the Office of Trust Fund Management, and I received the first one, the second one, the third one, and there has been one every year since.  Q. And the first initial ones were done by Griffin as the  A. That's correct.	2 3 4 03:09:59 5 6 7 8 9 03:10:24 10 11 12 13 14 03:10:46 15 16 17 18 19 03:11:03 20 21	Is this one of the is this the first of the Arthur Andersen audits of BIA that you referred to earlier?  A. Yes.  Q. All right. Let's look then at the next page well, let's go one more after that. And let's blow up first of all, the date is May 11, 1990. And you can see that it's for the periods that it said on the cover, and let's look down at the bottom two paragraphs of this first page.  And in the next to last paragraph on this page, it talks about "The 1988 audit was the first known financial statement audit by independent public accountants of the tribal and individual Indian monies trust funds managed by the Bureau, and the scope of our engagement was not sufficient with respect to the financial statements for preceding periods, from inception through September 30, 1987, to enable us to determine the propriety of trust fund balances resulting from prior activity, and what portions of adjustments identified in our 1988 audit related to prior periods." Do you see that?  A. Yes.  Q. Now, was this an audit that you reviewed while it was dated before you became special trustee, is this something you
2 3 4 03:06:37 5 6 7 8 9 03:06:49 10 11 12 13 14 03:07:13 15 16 17 18 19 03:07:36 20 21 22	at that time. They were all qualified, for the reasons I suggested earlier, and essentially for missing records. The fact that the  Q. I'm just looking for what we'll get into the particular ones.  A. All right. For the same reasons.  Q. You first got Arthur Andersen audits of BIA for four years in the late 1980s.  A. That's correct. All right. The next one then was the tribal reconciliation project, also conducted by Arthur Andersen, which attempted to do a GAAP/GAAS audit of the transactions for the tribes in the 1971 to 1992 period.  Q. So that's kind of the second item. And you mentioned there were four?  A. I was the receiving official on those. The next one was a selected audit by an independent outside audit that was required by the Reform Act for the Office of Trust Fund Management, and I received the first one, the second one, the third one, and there has been one every year since.  Q. And the first initial ones were done by Griffin as the  A. That's correct.  Q as the auditing company?	2 3 4 03:09:59 5 6 7 8 9 03:10:24 10 11 12 13 14 03:10:46 15 16 17 18 19 03:11:03 20 21 22	Is this one of the is this the first of the Arthur Andersen audits of BIA that you referred to earlier?  A. Yes.  Q. All right. Let's look then at the next page well, let's go one more after that. And let's blow up first of all, the date is May 11, 1990. And you can see that it's for the periods that it said on the cover, and let's look down at the bottom two paragraphs of this first page.  And in the next to last paragraph on this page, it talks about "The 1988 audit was the first known financial statement audit by independent public accountants of the tribal and individual Indian monies trust funds managed by the Bureau, and the scope of our engagement was not sufficient with respect to the financial statements for preceding periods, from inception through September 30, 1987, to enable us to determine the propriety of trust fund balances resulting from prior activity, and what portions of adjustments identified in our 1988 audit related to prior periods." Do you see that?  A. Yes.  Q. Now, was this an audit that you reviewed while it was dated before you became special trustee, is this something you became aware of and reviewed while you were special trustee?
2 3 4 03:06:37 5 6 7 8 9 03:06:49 10 11 12 13 14 03:07:13 15 16 17 18 19 03:07:36 20 21 22 23	at that time. They were all qualified, for the reasons I suggested earlier, and essentially for missing records. The fact that the  Q. I'm just looking for what we'll get into the particular ones.  A. All right. For the same reasons.  Q. You first got Arthur Andersen audits of BIA for four years in the late 1980s.  A. That's correct. All right. The next one then was the tribal reconciliation project, also conducted by Arthur Andersen, which attempted to do a GAAP/GAAS audit of the transactions for the tribes in the 1971 to 1992 period.  Q. So that's kind of the second item. And you mentioned there were four?  A. I was the receiving official on those. The next one was a selected audit by an independent outside audit that was required by the Reform Act for the Office of Trust Fund Management, and I received the first one, the second one, the third one, and there has been one every year since.  Q. And the first initial ones were done by Griffin as the  A. That's correct.  Q as the auditing company?  A. Right.	2 3 4 03:09:59 5 6 7 8 9 03:10:24 10 11 12 13 14 03:10:46 15 16 17 18 19 03:11:03 20 21 22 23	Is this one of the is this the first of the Arthur Andersen audits of BIA that you referred to earlier?  A. Yes.  Q. All right. Let's look then at the next page well, let's go one more after that. And let's blow up first of all, the date is May 11, 1990. And you can see that it's for the periods that it said on the cover, and let's look down at the bottom two paragraphs of this first page.  And in the next to last paragraph on this page, it talks about "The 1988 audit was the first known financial statement audit by independent public accountants of the tribal and individual Indian monies trust funds managed by the Bureau, and the scope of our engagement was not sufficient with respect to the financial statements for preceding periods, from inception through September 30, 1987, to enable us to determine the propriety of trust fund balances resulting from prior activity, and what portions of adjustments identified in our 1988 audit related to prior periods." Do you see that?  A. Yes.  Q. Now, was this an audit that you reviewed while it was dated before you became special trustee, is this something you became aware of and reviewed while you were special trustee?  A. Yes. We were interested in what they were I was
2 3 4 03:06:37 5 6 7 8 9 03:06:49 10 11 12 13 14 03:07:13 15 16 17 18 19 03:07:36 20 21 22 23 24	at that time. They were all qualified, for the reasons I suggested earlier, and essentially for missing records. The fact that the  Q. I'm just looking for what we'll get into the particular ones.  A. All right. For the same reasons.  Q. You first got Arthur Andersen audits of BIA for four years in the late 1980s.  A. That's correct. All right. The next one then was the tribal reconciliation project, also conducted by Arthur Andersen, which attempted to do a GAAP/GAAS audit of the transactions for the tribes in the 1971 to 1992 period.  Q. So that's kind of the second item. And you mentioned there were four?  A. I was the receiving official on those. The next one was a selected audit by an independent outside audit that was required by the Reform Act for the Office of Trust Fund Management, and I received the first one, the second one, the third one, and there has been one every year since.  Q. And the first initial ones were done by Griffin as the  A. That's correct.  Q as the auditing company?  A. Right.  Q. And have you reviewed even the most recent one of those	2 3 4 03:09:59 5 6 7 8 9 03:10:24 10 11 12 13 14 03:10:46 15 16 17 18 19 03:11:03 20 21 22 23 24	Is this one of the is this the first of the Arthur Andersen audits of BIA that you referred to earlier?  A. Yes.  Q. All right. Let's look then at the next page well, let's go one more after that. And let's blow up first of all, the date is May 11, 1990. And you can see that it's for the periods that it said on the cover, and let's look down at the bottom two paragraphs of this first page.  And in the next to last paragraph on this page, it talks about "The 1988 audit was the first known financial statement audit by independent public accountants of the tribal and individual Indian monies trust funds managed by the Bureau, and the scope of our engagement was not sufficient with respect to the financial statements for preceding periods, from inception through September 30, 1987, to enable us to determine the propriety of trust fund balances resulting from prior activity, and what portions of adjustments identified in our 1988 audit related to prior periods." Do you see that?  A. Yes.  Q. Now, was this an audit that you reviewed while it was dated before you became special trustee, is this something you became aware of and reviewed while you were special trustee?  A. Yes. We were interested in what they were I was receiving the 1995 audit at the time from Arthur Andersen on the
2 3 4 03:06:37 5 6 7 8 9 03:06:49 10 11 12 13 14 03:07:13 15 16 17 18 19 03:07:36 20 21 22 23	at that time. They were all qualified, for the reasons I suggested earlier, and essentially for missing records. The fact that the  Q. I'm just looking for what we'll get into the particular ones.  A. All right. For the same reasons.  Q. You first got Arthur Andersen audits of BIA for four years in the late 1980s.  A. That's correct. All right. The next one then was the tribal reconciliation project, also conducted by Arthur Andersen, which attempted to do a GAAP/GAAS audit of the transactions for the tribes in the 1971 to 1992 period.  Q. So that's kind of the second item. And you mentioned there were four?  A. I was the receiving official on those. The next one was a selected audit by an independent outside audit that was required by the Reform Act for the Office of Trust Fund Management, and I received the first one, the second one, the third one, and there has been one every year since.  Q. And the first initial ones were done by Griffin as the  A. That's correct.  Q as the auditing company?  A. Right.  Q. And have you reviewed even the most recent one of those audits, which have continued since you left as Special Trustee,	2 3 4 03:09:59 5 6 7 8 9 03:10:24 10 11 12 13 14 03:10:46 15 16 17 18 19 03:11:03 20 21 22 23	Is this one of the is this the first of the Arthur Andersen audits of BIA that you referred to earlier?  A. Yes.  Q. All right. Let's look then at the next page well, let's go one more after that. And let's blow up first of all, the date is May 11, 1990. And you can see that it's for the periods that it said on the cover, and let's look down at the bottom two paragraphs of this first page.  And in the next to last paragraph on this page, it talks about "The 1988 audit was the first known financial statement audit by independent public accountants of the tribal and individual Indian monies trust funds managed by the Bureau, and the scope of our engagement was not sufficient with respect to the financial statements for preceding periods, from inception through September 30, 1987, to enable us to determine the propriety of trust fund balances resulting from prior activity, and what portions of adjustments identified in our 1988 audit related to prior periods." Do you see that?  A. Yes.  Q. Now, was this an audit that you reviewed while it was dated before you became special trustee, is this something you became aware of and reviewed while you were special trustee?  A. Yes. We were interested in what they were I was receiving the 1995 audit at the time from Arthur Andersen on the tribal reconciliation. I was interested in what they were able
2 3 4 03:06:37 5 6 7 8 9 03:06:49 10 11 12 13 14 03:07:13 15 16 17 18 19 03:07:36 20 21 22 23 24	at that time. They were all qualified, for the reasons I suggested earlier, and essentially for missing records. The fact that the  Q. I'm just looking for what we'll get into the particular ones.  A. All right. For the same reasons.  Q. You first got Arthur Andersen audits of BIA for four years in the late 1980s.  A. That's correct. All right. The next one then was the tribal reconciliation project, also conducted by Arthur Andersen, which attempted to do a GAAP/GAAS audit of the transactions for the tribes in the 1971 to 1992 period.  Q. So that's kind of the second item. And you mentioned there were four?  A. I was the receiving official on those. The next one was a selected audit by an independent outside audit that was required by the Reform Act for the Office of Trust Fund Management, and I received the first one, the second one, the third one, and there has been one every year since.  Q. And the first initial ones were done by Griffin as the  A. That's correct.  Q as the auditing company?  A. Right.  Q. And have you reviewed even the most recent one of those	2 3 4 03:09:59 5 6 7 8 9 03:10:24 10 11 12 13 14 03:10:46 15 16 17 18 19 03:11:03 20 21 22 23 24	Is this one of the is this the first of the Arthur Andersen audits of BIA that you referred to earlier?  A. Yes.  Q. All right. Let's look then at the next page well, let's go one more after that. And let's blow up first of all, the date is May 11, 1990. And you can see that it's for the periods that it said on the cover, and let's look down at the bottom two paragraphs of this first page.  And in the next to last paragraph on this page, it talks about "The 1988 audit was the first known financial statement audit by independent public accountants of the tribal and individual Indian monies trust funds managed by the Bureau, and the scope of our engagement was not sufficient with respect to the financial statements for preceding periods, from inception through September 30, 1987, to enable us to determine the propriety of trust fund balances resulting from prior activity, and what portions of adjustments identified in our 1988 audit related to prior periods." Do you see that?  A. Yes.  Q. Now, was this an audit that you reviewed while it was dated before you became special trustee, is this something you became aware of and reviewed while you were special trustee?  A. Yes. We were interested in what they were I was receiving the 1995 audit at the time from Arthur Andersen on the

Page 1524 to 1527 of 1533

10/22/2007 09:13:37 PM

31 of 33 sheets

	1528		1530
1	to do in 1988 for essentially the same, covering the same	1	accounting systems that were turned over to the Bureau in 1971
2	accounts, and the tribal accounts back to 1971. So I did	2	by the Treasury have been out of balance every year up to 1997,
3	review that at that time, and also the notes, which I'm sure	3	with cumulative general ledger differences that I believe
4	you're going to show next.	4	exceeded 105 million, if I remember correctly.
03:11:52 <b>5</b>	Q. The notes are referred to in that next paragraph, that I	03:15:43 <b>5</b>	Q. And you've indicated this was the first audit by an
6	will not read aloud, but if you would look at them, it refers to	6	outside
7	note 3, and then it notes a for several reasons, 1 and 2 on	7	A. Well, it describes the first audit. The first audit was
8	that page, with 2 being major inadequacies in the accounting	8	done as of 1998.
9	records, and then it goes over to the next page.	9	MR. DORRIS: All right. And Your Honor, can we pick
03:12:14 10	A. Yes. And what that means to me is that the accounting	03:15:54 10	up here in the morning?
11	balances cannot be confirmed. And that goes to the beginning	11	THE COURT: Yeah. That brings us right to 5:00.
12	account balances not only of the general ledger but of each	12	Thank you, counsel. We will be adjourned until 9:30 tomorrow
13	subsidiary account, including the IIM subsidiary accounts.	13	morning.
14	Q. And it refers to the Bureau in here a number of times. And	14	MR. GINGOLD: Your Honor, I have a question.
03:12:32 15	who is that?	03:16:04 15	THE COURT: Yes, sir.
16	A. The Bureau of Indian Affairs.	16	MR. GINGOLD: You indicated last week we may go to
17	Q. Okay. So references to the Bureau here is	17	Friday. If that's the case we'd like to be
18	A. "BIA," "Bureau of Indian Affairs" are used interchangeably.	18	THE COURT: I thought I smiled when I said that.
19	Q. Let's look at you indicated the notes, and we do want to	19	(Laughter)
03:12:47 20	look at the notes. Let's look over I think it's page 10 of	03:16:13 20	MR. GINGOLD: One point, however. We brought in a lot
21	this exhibit. It's going to be page 9, the one before that,	21	of witnesses to make sure there are no gaps, so it may mean we
22	please. And the one before that. So it's page No. 8.	22	may need to bleed over to Friday to finish off the last witness
23	And would you highlight toward the bottom there. You	23	on Thursday, if that's okay.
24	recall that, when we were just looking at reference note 3, and	24	THE COURT: You're going to finish this case on
03:13:31 <b>25</b>	I'm now showing you what is note 3 in that financial statement.	03:16:28 <b>25</b>	Thursday?
00.10.01	Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR	00.10.20	Bryan A. Wayne, RPR, CRR
	Official Court Reporter		Official Court Reporter
			'
	1529		1531
1	Do you see it, sir?	1	
1 2		1 2	MR. GINGOLD: No, Your Honor. But we have a witness that won't be able to come back.
	Do you see it, sir?		MR. GINGOLD: No, Your Honor. But we have a witness
2	Do you see it, sir?  A. Yes.	2	MR. GINGOLD: No, Your Honor. But we have a witness that won't be able to come back.
3	Do you see it, sir?  A. Yes.  Q. Okay. Now, would you take a moment and read that first	3	MR. GINGOLD: No, Your Honor. But we have a witness that won't be able to come back.  THE COURT: Well, we'll talk about this in the
2 3 4	Do you see it, sir?  A. Yes.  Q. Okay. Now, would you take a moment and read that first paragraph to yourself?	2 3 4	MR. GINGOLD: No, Your Honor. But we have a witness that won't be able to come back.  THE COURT: Well, we'll talk about this in the morning. I don't think we're going to sit on Friday, but we'll
2 3 4 03:13:43 5	Do you see it, sir?  A. Yes.  Q. Okay. Now, would you take a moment and read that first paragraph to yourself?  (Witness reviewing document.)	2 3 4 03:16:38 5	MR. GINGOLD: No, Your Honor. But we have a witness that won't be able to come back.  THE COURT: Well, we'll talk about this in the morning. I don't think we're going to sit on Friday, but we'll talk about it in the morning.
2 3 4 03:13:43 5 6	Do you see it, sir?  A. Yes.  Q. Okay. Now, would you take a moment and read that first paragraph to yourself?  (Witness reviewing document.)  A. Yes.	2 3 4 03:16:38 5 6	MR. GINGOLD: No, Your Honor. But we have a witness that won't be able to come back.  THE COURT: Well, we'll talk about this in the morning. I don't think we're going to sit on Friday, but we'll talk about it in the morning.
2 3 4 03:13:43 5 6 7	Do you see it, sir?  A. Yes.  Q. Okay. Now, would you take a moment and read that first paragraph to yourself?  (Witness reviewing document.)  A. Yes.  Q. And after that and we'll look at these pages in just a	2 3 4 03:16:38 5 6 7	MR. GINGOLD: No, Your Honor. But we have a witness that won't be able to come back.  THE COURT: Well, we'll talk about this in the morning. I don't think we're going to sit on Friday, but we'll talk about it in the morning.
2 3 4 03:13:43 5 6 7 8	Do you see it, sir?  A. Yes.  Q. Okay. Now, would you take a moment and read that first paragraph to yourself?  (Witness reviewing document.)  A. Yes.  Q. And after that and we'll look at these pages in just a minute there are 16 separate individual items listed there.	2 3 4 03:16:38 5 6 7 8	MR. GINGOLD: No, Your Honor. But we have a witness that won't be able to come back.  THE COURT: Well, we'll talk about this in the morning. I don't think we're going to sit on Friday, but we'll talk about it in the morning.
2 3 4 03:13:43 5 6 7 8 9	A. Yes.  Q. Okay. Now, would you take a moment and read that first paragraph to yourself?  (Witness reviewing document.)  A. Yes.  Q. And after that and we'll look at these pages in just a minute there are 16 separate individual items listed there.  And I don't want us to look at each of those. But can you	2 3 4 03:16:38 5 6 7 8 9	MR. GINGOLD: No, Your Honor. But we have a witness that won't be able to come back.  THE COURT: Well, we'll talk about this in the morning. I don't think we're going to sit on Friday, but we'll talk about it in the morning.
2 3 4 03:13:43 5 6 7 8 9 03:14:09 10	A. Yes.  Q. Okay. Now, would you take a moment and read that first paragraph to yourself?  (Witness reviewing document.)  A. Yes.  Q. And after that and we'll look at these pages in just a minute there are 16 separate individual items listed there.  And I don't want us to look at each of those. But can you summarize what that says to you as someone with your background	2 3 4 03:16:38 5 6 7 8 9	MR. GINGOLD: No, Your Honor. But we have a witness that won't be able to come back.  THE COURT: Well, we'll talk about this in the morning. I don't think we're going to sit on Friday, but we'll talk about it in the morning.
2 3 4 03:13:43 5 6 7 8 9 03:14:09 10 11	Do you see it, sir?  A. Yes.  Q. Okay. Now, would you take a moment and read that first paragraph to yourself?  (Witness reviewing document.)  A. Yes.  Q. And after that and we'll look at these pages in just a minute there are 16 separate individual items listed there.  And I don't want us to look at each of those. But can you summarize what that says to you as someone with your background as a bank examiner in looking at trust departments, what this	2 3 4 03:16:38 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR. GINGOLD: No, Your Honor. But we have a witness that won't be able to come back.  THE COURT: Well, we'll talk about this in the morning. I don't think we're going to sit on Friday, but we'll talk about it in the morning.
2 3 4 03:13:43 5 6 7 8 9 03:14:09 10 11	A. Yes.  Q. Okay. Now, would you take a moment and read that first paragraph to yourself?  (Witness reviewing document.)  A. Yes.  Q. And after that and we'll look at these pages in just a minute there are 16 separate individual items listed there.  And I don't want us to look at each of those. But can you summarize what that says to you as someone with your background as a bank examiner in looking at trust departments, what this tells you about a trust?	2 3 4 03:16:38 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. GINGOLD: No, Your Honor. But we have a witness that won't be able to come back.  THE COURT: Well, we'll talk about this in the morning. I don't think we're going to sit on Friday, but we'll talk about it in the morning.
2 3 4 03:13:43 5 6 7 8 9 03:14:09 10 11 12 13	A. Yes.  Q. Okay. Now, would you take a moment and read that first paragraph to yourself?  (Witness reviewing document.)  A. Yes.  Q. And after that and we'll look at these pages in just a minute there are 16 separate individual items listed there.  And I don't want us to look at each of those. But can you summarize what that says to you as someone with your background as a bank examiner in looking at trust departments, what this tells you about a trust?  A. These are basic governance and internal controls that were	2 3 4 03:16:38 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. GINGOLD: No, Your Honor. But we have a witness that won't be able to come back.  THE COURT: Well, we'll talk about this in the morning. I don't think we're going to sit on Friday, but we'll talk about it in the morning.
2 3 4 03:13:43 5 6 7 8 9 03:14:09 10 11 12 13 14	A. Yes.  Q. Okay. Now, would you take a moment and read that first paragraph to yourself? (Witness reviewing document.)  A. Yes.  Q. And after that and we'll look at these pages in just a minute there are 16 separate individual items listed there.  And I don't want us to look at each of those. But can you summarize what that says to you as someone with your background as a bank examiner in looking at trust departments, what this tells you about a trust?  A. These are basic governance and internal controls that were never implemented correctly and appropriately by the Bureau of	2 3 4 03:16:38 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. GINGOLD: No, Your Honor. But we have a witness that won't be able to come back.  THE COURT: Well, we'll talk about this in the morning. I don't think we're going to sit on Friday, but we'll talk about it in the morning.
2 3 4 03:13:43 5 6 7 8 9 03:14:09 10 11 12 13 14 03:14:31 15	A. Yes.  Q. Okay. Now, would you take a moment and read that first paragraph to yourself? (Witness reviewing document.)  A. Yes.  Q. And after that and we'll look at these pages in just a minute there are 16 separate individual items listed there.  And I don't want us to look at each of those. But can you summarize what that says to you as someone with your background as a bank examiner in looking at trust departments, what this tells you about a trust?  A. These are basic governance and internal controls that were never implemented correctly and appropriately by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. And they go to the weaknesses in staffing,	2 3 4 03:16:38 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. GINGOLD: No, Your Honor. But we have a witness that won't be able to come back.  THE COURT: Well, we'll talk about this in the morning. I don't think we're going to sit on Friday, but we'll talk about it in the morning.
2 3 4 03:13:43 5 6 7 8 9 03:14:09 10 11 12 13 14 03:14:31 15 16 17 18	A. Yes.  Q. Okay. Now, would you take a moment and read that first paragraph to yourself?  (Witness reviewing document.)  A. Yes.  Q. And after that and we'll look at these pages in just a minute there are 16 separate individual items listed there.  And I don't want us to look at each of those. But can you summarize what that says to you as someone with your background as a bank examiner in looking at trust departments, what this tells you about a trust?  A. These are basic governance and internal controls that were never implemented correctly and appropriately by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. And they go to the weaknesses in staffing, managerial and resource accounting appropriations, if you will,	2 3 4 03:16:38 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. GINGOLD: No, Your Honor. But we have a witness that won't be able to come back.  THE COURT: Well, we'll talk about this in the morning. I don't think we're going to sit on Friday, but we'll talk about it in the morning.
2 3 4 03:13:43 5 6 7 8 9 03:14:09 10 11 12 13 14 03:14:31 15 16 17 18 19	A. Yes.  Q. Okay. Now, would you take a moment and read that first paragraph to yourself? (Witness reviewing document.)  A. Yes.  Q. And after that and we'll look at these pages in just a minute there are 16 separate individual items listed there.  And I don't want us to look at each of those. But can you summarize what that says to you as someone with your background as a bank examiner in looking at trust departments, what this tells you about a trust?  A. These are basic governance and internal controls that were never implemented correctly and appropriately by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. And they go to the weaknesses in staffing, managerial and resource accounting appropriations, if you will, lack of training, and inconsistent trust accounting systems, the	2 3 4 03:16:38 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. GINGOLD: No, Your Honor. But we have a witness that won't be able to come back.  THE COURT: Well, we'll talk about this in the morning. I don't think we're going to sit on Friday, but we'll talk about it in the morning.
2 3 4 03:13:43 5 6 7 8 9 03:14:09 10 11 12 13 14 03:14:31 15 16 17 18 19 03:14:59 20	A. Yes.  Q. Okay. Now, would you take a moment and read that first paragraph to yourself? (Witness reviewing document.)  A. Yes.  Q. And after that and we'll look at these pages in just a minute there are 16 separate individual items listed there.  And I don't want us to look at each of those. But can you summarize what that says to you as someone with your background as a bank examiner in looking at trust departments, what this tells you about a trust?  A. These are basic governance and internal controls that were never implemented correctly and appropriately by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. And they go to the weaknesses in staffing, managerial and resource accounting appropriations, if you will, lack of training, and inconsistent trust accounting systems, the inability to do audits, any acceptable audits, GAAS or	2 3 4 03:16:38 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. GINGOLD: No, Your Honor. But we have a witness that won't be able to come back.  THE COURT: Well, we'll talk about this in the morning. I don't think we're going to sit on Friday, but we'll talk about it in the morning.
2 3 4 03:13:43 5 6 7 8 9 03:14:09 10 11 12 13 14 03:14:31 15 16 17 18 19 03:14:59 20 21	A. Yes.  Q. Okay. Now, would you take a moment and read that first paragraph to yourself?  (Witness reviewing document.)  A. Yes.  Q. And after that and we'll look at these pages in just a minute there are 16 separate individual items listed there.  And I don't want us to look at each of those. But can you summarize what that says to you as someone with your background as a bank examiner in looking at trust departments, what this tells you about a trust?  A. These are basic governance and internal controls that were never implemented correctly and appropriately by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. And they go to the weaknesses in staffing, managerial and resource accounting appropriations, if you will, lack of training, and inconsistent trust accounting systems, the inability to do audits, any acceptable audits, GAAS or otherwise.	2 3 4 03:16:38 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. GINGOLD: No, Your Honor. But we have a witness that won't be able to come back.  THE COURT: Well, we'll talk about this in the morning. I don't think we're going to sit on Friday, but we'll talk about it in the morning.
2 3 4 03:13:43 5 6 7 8 9 03:14:09 10 11 12 13 14 03:14:31 15 16 17 18 19 03:14:59 20 21 22	A. Yes.  Q. Okay. Now, would you take a moment and read that first paragraph to yourself?  (Witness reviewing document.)  A. Yes.  Q. And after that and we'll look at these pages in just a minute there are 16 separate individual items listed there.  And I don't want us to look at each of those. But can you summarize what that says to you as someone with your background as a bank examiner in looking at trust departments, what this tells you about a trust?  A. These are basic governance and internal controls that were never implemented correctly and appropriately by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. And they go to the weaknesses in staffing, managerial and resource accounting appropriations, if you will, lack of training, and inconsistent trust accounting systems, the inability to do audits, any acceptable audits, GAAS or otherwise.  And the burden here is that these accumulate over decades.	2 3 4 03:16:38 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. GINGOLD: No, Your Honor. But we have a witness that won't be able to come back.  THE COURT: Well, we'll talk about this in the morning. I don't think we're going to sit on Friday, but we'll talk about it in the morning.
2 3 4 03:13:43 5 6 7 8 9 03:14:09 10 11 12 13 14 03:14:31 15 16 17 18 19 03:14:59 20 21 22 23	A. Yes.  Q. Okay. Now, would you take a moment and read that first paragraph to yourself?  (Witness reviewing document.)  A. Yes.  Q. And after that and we'll look at these pages in just a minute there are 16 separate individual items listed there.  And I don't want us to look at each of those. But can you summarize what that says to you as someone with your background as a bank examiner in looking at trust departments, what this tells you about a trust?  A. These are basic governance and internal controls that were never implemented correctly and appropriately by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. And they go to the weaknesses in staffing, managerial and resource accounting appropriations, if you will, lack of training, and inconsistent trust accounting systems, the inability to do audits, any acceptable audits, GAAS or otherwise.  And the burden here is that these accumulate over decades. I believe the Angel report, if I remember, the last testimony documented these types of material weaknesses in accounting and internal controls dating back to the 1930s that were isolated by	2 3 4 03:16:38 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. GINGOLD: No, Your Honor. But we have a witness that won't be able to come back.  THE COURT: Well, we'll talk about this in the morning. I don't think we're going to sit on Friday, but we'll talk about it in the morning.
2 3 4 03:13:43 5 6 7 8 9 03:14:09 10 11 12 13 14 03:14:31 15 16 17 18 19 03:14:59 20 21 22 23 24	A. Yes. Q. Okay. Now, would you take a moment and read that first paragraph to yourself? (Witness reviewing document.) A. Yes. Q. And after that and we'll look at these pages in just a minute there are 16 separate individual items listed there. And I don't want us to look at each of those. But can you summarize what that says to you as someone with your background as a bank examiner in looking at trust departments, what this tells you about a trust? A. These are basic governance and internal controls that were never implemented correctly and appropriately by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. And they go to the weaknesses in staffing, managerial and resource accounting appropriations, if you will, lack of training, and inconsistent trust accounting systems, the inability to do audits, any acceptable audits, GAAS or otherwise.  And the burden here is that these accumulate over decades. I believe the Angel report, if I remember, the last testimony documented these types of material weaknesses in accounting and internal controls dating back to the 1930s that were isolated by GAO and the like.	2 3 4 03:16:38 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR. GINGOLD: No, Your Honor. But we have a witness that won't be able to come back.  THE COURT: Well, we'll talk about this in the morning. I don't think we're going to sit on Friday, but we'll talk about it in the morning.
2 3 4 03:13:43 5 6 7 8 9 03:14:09 10 11 12 13 14 03:14:31 15 16 17 18 19 03:14:59 20 21 22 23	A. Yes. Q. Okay. Now, would you take a moment and read that first paragraph to yourself? (Witness reviewing document.) A. Yes. Q. And after that and we'll look at these pages in just a minute there are 16 separate individual items listed there. And I don't want us to look at each of those. But can you summarize what that says to you as someone with your background as a bank examiner in looking at trust departments, what this tells you about a trust? A. These are basic governance and internal controls that were never implemented correctly and appropriately by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. And they go to the weaknesses in staffing, managerial and resource accounting appropriations, if you will, lack of training, and inconsistent trust accounting systems, the inability to do audits, any acceptable audits, GAAS or otherwise.  And the burden here is that these accumulate over decades. I believe the Angel report, if I remember, the last testimony documented these types of material weaknesses in accounting and internal controls dating back to the 1930s that were isolated by GAO and the like.  I know for a fact, because I looked myself, that the trust	2 3 4 03:16:38 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. GINGOLD: No, Your Honor. But we have a witness that won't be able to come back.  THE COURT: Well, we'll talk about this in the morning. I don't think we're going to sit on Friday, but we'll talk about it in the morning.  (Proceedings adjourned at 5:00 p.m.)
2 3 4 03:13:43 5 6 7 8 9 03:14:09 10 11 12 13 14 03:14:31 15 16 17 18 19 03:14:59 20 21 22 23 24	A. Yes. Q. Okay. Now, would you take a moment and read that first paragraph to yourself? (Witness reviewing document.) A. Yes. Q. And after that and we'll look at these pages in just a minute there are 16 separate individual items listed there. And I don't want us to look at each of those. But can you summarize what that says to you as someone with your background as a bank examiner in looking at trust departments, what this tells you about a trust? A. These are basic governance and internal controls that were never implemented correctly and appropriately by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. And they go to the weaknesses in staffing, managerial and resource accounting appropriations, if you will, lack of training, and inconsistent trust accounting systems, the inability to do audits, any acceptable audits, GAAS or otherwise.  And the burden here is that these accumulate over decades. I believe the Angel report, if I remember, the last testimony documented these types of material weaknesses in accounting and internal controls dating back to the 1930s that were isolated by GAO and the like.	2 3 4 03:16:38 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR. GINGOLD: No, Your Honor. But we have a witness that won't be able to come back.  THE COURT: Well, we'll talk about this in the morning. I don't think we're going to sit on Friday, but we'll talk about it in the morning.

			1532
1		INDEX	
2	WITNESS:	PAGE:	
3			
4	Dwight Duncan	Direct Examination cont' Cross-Examination	1452
5	Paul Homan	Redirect Examination  Direct Examination	
6		****	
7		EXHIBITS RECEIVED	
8	Plaintiff Exhibit Nos. P	PX 4284, 4484	1450
9		PX 4486 PX 4468, 4485	1450 1452
10		****	
11 12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17 18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24 25			
<b></b>			

1533

\* \* \* \* \* \* \*
CERTIFICATE

I, BRYAN A. WAYNE, Official Court Reporter, certify that

the foregoing pages are a correct transcript from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter.

BRYAN A. WAYNE